

PENDLETON
ON
BAPTISM & COMMUNION.

BAP
P3983c
1841


Yearly
Journal of the Theological Seminary,


PRINCETON, N. J.


Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.

50B
10266









CONVERSATION

BETWEEN TWO LAYMEN,

ON THE SUBJECTS AND MODE OF

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM

AND

CHURCH COMMUNION,

FORMING A COMPLETE MANUAL,

BY CHAS. H. PENDLETON,

MEMBER OF THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, CLEVELAND.

Let TRUTH grapple with ERROR; who ever knew TRUTH worsted in a free and open encounter?—MILTON.

"Buy the truth, and sell it not."—"Truth needs no apology, and error deserves none."

"Earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints."

CLEVELAND:

SOLD BY SANFORD & CO., (CLEVELAND, O.; A. S. MADDOX, RICHMOND, VA.

GOULD, KENDALL & LINCOLN, AND THE N. E. S. SCHOOL UNION

DEPOSITORY, BOSTON; GEO. P. DANIELS, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

AM. BAP. PUB. S. S. DEPOSITORY, PHIL.; J. BARKER, N. Y.

AND BENNET, BACKUS & HAWLEY, UTICA, N. Y.

1841.

Entered according to act of Congress, by
CHAS. H. PENDLETON,
in the Clerk's Office of the District of Ohio,

RECOMMENDATIONS.

[From the Rev. Levi Tucker, A. M. Pastor of the First Baptist Church,
Cleveland.]

C. H. PENDLETON.

Dear Brother:

I have examined with much interest and profit, your *Manuel on Baptism and Communion*, and am convinced in my own mind, that it is destined to do much good. Although there has been much written, and many volumes are now before the public on the subject, yet there is still, upon this most expressive and important ordinance, a vast amount of ignorance in the Christian church. It is therefore clearly the duty of the Baptists, in the exercise of Christian charity, to give their erring brethren "line upon line, and precept upon precept," and exhort them to "make straight paths for their feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way." Your references to classic usage, and quotations from the FATHERS, and from modern Pedobaptists, triumphantly answer all objections, and completely settles the fact, that believers are the only subjects, and immersion the only mode of gospel baptism. Your reasoning upon the subject from the "usus loquendi" of the terms employed in the ordinance of baptism, is irrefragable.—Infant sprinkling is most unquestionably the very foundation and pillar of *POPERY*, designed to be the great link to connect church and state, in order to form a NATIONAL RELIGION, and so to unite the kingdom of light with the kingdom of darkness, as to form a misty twilight, in the dimness of which, things doubtful and anti-scriptural should appear to be "confirmation strong as proofs of holy writ."

I believe it must, and will appear to every candid reader of your excellent *Manuel*, that infant subjects, and a sprinkling mode of gospel baptism, were alike unauthorized by Jesus Christ or his apostles, and unknown in the first centuries of the church, and are, by whom ever practised, the certain badges of their descent from the "Mistress of Babylon," the "MOTHER CHURCH."

Your views of communion, I think equally clear and conclusive. Whoever wishes to become fully acquainted with the objections commonly urged against the Baptists, upon the subjects of baptism and the communion, will see them fairly stated, and most clearly refuted, in this work. No Baptist can rise from a perusal of it, without feeling fully convinced in his own mind, that his sentiments, as a BAPTIST, are a part of that immutable truth, "which shall abide and live forever."

It gives me very great pleasure, to recommend this work to the Christian public, hoping and praying that it may prove a "light to the feet, and a lamp to the path" of every humble and sincere inquirer after truth.

LEVI TUCKER.

CLEVELAND, June 28, 1840.

[From the Rev. Joseph Elliott, A. M. late Principal of Middlebury Academy,
Wyoming, N. Y.]

CHARLES H. PENDLETON, Esq.

Dear Brother:

I have read much on the subject discussed in your pamphlet, which you had the politeness to allow me the pleasure hastily to peruse, but have seen nothing embracing the merits of the subject, so well adapted to do good to the common reader, and yet in-

struct the CLASSICAL scholar, as your work on "Christian Baptism and Church Fellowship." The great excellency of your work consists in placing the arguments pro and con in juxtaposition, in plain conversation between the BAPTIST and PEDOBAPTIST, allowing each an equally fair opportunity to present his strongest proof to support his own side of the question, and to ask his opponent all the explanations of his belief, that the nature of the discussion might suggest. I am also pleased to find that, although much has been written on the subjects by the ablest pens, you have presented no small amount of original matter of the best kind, to enrich the minds of even our best read men on the subject. It gives me no small pleasure to add, that the whole work is conducted in a spirit of Christian kindness, which never fails to sweeten the cup of controversy, on all subjects relating to our holy religion. It gives me the highest gratification to know, that the author is a Layman, the first, to my knowledge, who has written with any considerable ability on the subject.

I devoutly hope, that every person, in search of truth and Christian ordinances, will read and profit by a wide circulation of your excellent Manuel.

Yours in the Lord,

JOSEPH ELLIOTT.

CLEVELAND, July, 1840.

N. B. It is proper to state here, that when I commenced writing this work, it was my intention to spread out before the reader, the most prominent arguments of Baptists and Pedobaptists, on this controverted subject, in the form of a tract; but, as Bunyan remarked, with reference to his Pilgrim's Progress,

"Still as I pulled, it came, and so I penned
It down, until it came at last to be,
For length and breadth, the bigness which you see."

AUTHOR.

ERRATA.

Page 3d, 1st line, for TRACT read CONVERSATION; 14th line from bottom, for TREATIES read TREATISE. Page 5th, the word PLACE should not be italicised. Page 11th, 11th line from top, for faith and discipleship read faith or discipleship. Page 13, 2d line from top, for TRACT read CONVERSATION. Page 15, bottom line, for HIS household read HIS OWN household. P. 16, 7th line from bottom, leave out THAT. P. 17, for (Acts v.) read (Acts 15); 16th and 17th line from bottom, for "male children and adults" read MALES. P. 24, Note, 4th line, for "their uses" read "these uses;" 6th line, for "you represent" read "you represents." P. 25, 5th line from top, for "or those" read "and those." P. 30, 4th line, for Zenophen read Xenophon; 5th line, for Polybus read Polybius. P. 33, Chrysostom should be spelled Chrysostom—in one or two other instances it is spelled wrong. In a note by Dr. Campbell, for "ex tou" read "ek tou." P. 35, 7th line from bottom, for "goes" read "go." P. 36, 7th line from top for "metanoico" read "metaneo." P. 37, 17th line, for "liberally" read "liberally." P. 38, 8th and 9th line from top, instead of Alegany read Allegany, and Gibraltar read Gibraltar. P. 42, for "esniments" read "sentiments." P. 43, 4th line in small type, for Syrac read Syriac, and Hervy should be Hervey. P. 45, in the testimony of Tertullian for "tingu" read "tingi;" 6th line from bottom, for "True immersion" read "Time immersion." P. 46, for Olshausen read Olshausen. P. 47, near the middle, for "cliner baptism" read "clinic baptism." P. 48, 8th line from top, for "The reader" read "You." P. 51, 23d line, for "space" read "time." P. 53, 5th line, for "solicituous," read "solicitous;" 10th, 11th, and 20th lines, for "baptizontia" read "baptizontai." P. 66, 14th line, for "Jhis" read "their." P. 80, 15th line for "refuses" read "refused;" 21st line, for "unto" read "into." Page 92, 5th line from top, for Henry read Hervey; 2d line of Note, for "All of the valuable" read "And so all of the valuable." P. 106, 4th line from top, for "as" read "thus." P. 124, bottom line, for "polite" read "polity."

P R E F A C E .

In publishing this tract, it is far from the intentions of the writer to excite unkind feelings between the members of different denominations, or to weaken the bands of Christian love and affection, which spiritually unite all who love our Savior. But it is to invite all to the fresh examination of a subject, which has already received some attention in almost every Christian community, and which is destined to receive much more, ere all the disciples of Christ shall "see eye to eye,"—to awaken, if possible, a deeper reverence for the authority of the Bible, and all the commands of Christ. For we believe when all christians come up to the requirements of Christ, a visible union WILL THEN TAKE PLACE. And, as we believe the "Baptists are more nearly conformed in doctrine and rites to the model of the primitive churches, than any other denomination," it follows that if we labor to advance THEIR SENTIMENTS, it becomes identical with laboring for the welfare and promotion of Christ's kingdom. While I readily admit that many, who differ from us with respect to these doctrines and rites, are among the excellent of the earth, I cannot, out of mere respect to them, abstain from vindicating the institutions of Christ. This would be to show a greater deference to man than God. "Every plant," says Jesus, "that my heavenly father hath not planted, must be rooted up." To permit then THE TRADITIONS OF MEN to pass for THE ORDINANCES OF GOD, without any attempt to produce a reformation to primitive practice, would be to disobey the injunction,—“Contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints.”

The importance of union among Christians is acknowledged by all; and we trust we shall be enabled to show that there is ground on which all evangelical christians can unite, even at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and that too without sacrificing any principle. Now if such ground as this can be found, and any evangelical christian denomination is unwilling to occupy it, then it follows that THAT DENOMINATION prefers disunion to union—restricted church communion to the general communion of the Godly.

Many are dissuaded from the examination of this subject by being told that it is non-essential, or, "by considering it as a thing of small moment, and that time is better spent in schemes of general usefulness. That Baptism is a thing of small moment, is an opinion that is not likely to have been suggested by the accounts of it in the Scriptures. It is an ordinance that strikingly represents the truth that saves the soul; and is peremptorily enjoined on all who believe. But were it the very least of all the commandments of Jesus, it demands attention and obedience at the hazard of life itself. Nothing that Christ has appointed can be innocently neglected. To suppose that schemes of general usefulness ought to take place of the commandments of God," is a direct reflection on the wisdom of Jehovah.

We are willing, reader, after saying on each side of this question what we deem apposite, to leave it with you to judge for your self. But we would "remind you that your judgment will influence your practice, and that will be examined, and the consequences of it will be yours in eternity.

"Two things we wish you to believe. One is, That TRUTH will be HONORABLE, when ERROR shall be made ASHAMED. The other is, That truth embraced and truth practiced is the road to heaven, and the wisest course on earth."

The author of this, several years since, examined this subject. During that investigation, which produced the distinct conviction in his own mind that the Baptists stood on the vantage ground of truth, he read some of the ablest works on both sides of this controversy. He has also made himself acquainted with the more recent works of note on this subject, (issued from the American press.) To what extent he is indebted for the views contained in this pamphlet to the above examinations, it would be impossible for him to tell. Wherever he has copied from any work he has used the quotation marks. While presenting his own views on this subject, he has availed himself of the labors of others, and has endeavored, with candor and fairness, to state and examine briefly some of the most prominent arguments of those who have written on the other side. For some of the ideas contained in this pamphlet, the author freely acknowledges that he is indebted to Prof. Jewett's recent work, to Lynd's, and Carson's treatises, and to the Christian Review, edited by Prof. Sears, &c. The opinions of the German critics, and the examination of the ancient Fathers, have been derived mostly from the Review, a very able quarterly work published in Boston, which every Baptist who can, ought to take.

The object of this publication is not so much to instruct the learned, as it is to lead the humble inquirer after truth into the clear understanding of the word of God.

Having been requested, while at the east, to write a tract on this subject, the hope of usefulness alone has at last induced the author to comply with that request. It is with extreme reluctance that he consents to publish this in so imperfect a state. The only apology he has to make is, that it was written in great haste, and in detached portions of time. (The most of his time being otherwise occupied.)

With a sincere desire that this humble effort may remove prejudice and advance the cause of TRUTH, AND CHRISTIAN UNION, the author commits it to the great Head of the Church.

INTRODUCTION,

"It is reported to have been said by Coleridge, 'there is the love of the good for the good's sake, and the love of the truth for the truth's sake. To see, clearly, that the love of the good and the true is ultimately identical,—is given only to those who love both sincerely, and without any foreign ends.' Alas! how often have they been disjoined! On the one side, how many have been disposed to promote what is good, at the expense of truth; and, on the other, how many, in promoting the cause of truth, have sacrificed what is good, and clothed themselves with the spirit of bitterness and strife as with a garment! A visible and acknowledged union among all Christians is a great good—a consummation devoutly to be wished,—but how is it to be accomplished? Most certainly, not by denunciation or silence; not by truces and compromises, by legislation or acts of diplomacy; but it must be done, if done at all, by each seeking truth with an honest heart, acting according to it and SPEAKING IT IN LOVE. Christian union can flourish in no other soil, but a 'KNOWLEDGE OF THE TRUTH.' 'If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.' Whoever seeks truth from the love of it, and in love endeavors to diffuse it, does something to promote the real unity of the church. For, even if he adopts some incidental error, the spirit of his mind will lead him to receive fresh light with thankfulness, and thus truth will gain the greater triumph. As far as different sects of Christians are already agreed on essential truths, so far it becomes them to cherish for each other, as Christians, a fervent fellowship. If we have 'one Lord, one Faith, one God and Father of all,' even though we have not 'one baptism,' we ought to love each other, with pure hearts fervently. In such a case, we have already laid the basis for a cordial union of spirit, and through obedience to the truth have purified our souls unto unfeigned love of the brethren.

The difference of opinion between the Baptists and other evangelical Christians, is not so much touching the spiritual doctrines of the church, as its constitution. They do already, if they breathe the spirit of their system, hold spiritual communion with all who love Christ,—the same kind of communion which will prevail in heaven, where the state of society will not require any tangible memorials, to transmit from age to age the remembrance of the Savior's death. But they differ from other Christians on this question: What is essential to the right constitution of the Christian church? They set out with the great principle, that none but moral agents, who act from choice, are proper subjects of church membership or church ordinances. They not only say, with others, that the church is a spiritual association, and that its constitution is not national, but thence infer that none are brought into alliance with it by natural birth, or blood, or parental dedication. They hold, with John Locke, that 'a church is a free and voluntary society; nobody is born a member of any church; otherwise, the religion of parents would descend unto children by the same right of inheritance as their temporal estates, and every one would hold his faith by the same tenure as he does his lands.' They deny, that there is any power inherent or conferred, in outward rites, to bring a human being into covenant with God. Hence, they withhold the initiating rite of Christianity from all, except those who profess repentance for sin and faith in Christ. These principles they deem of high importance, and value a right constitution of the church, not only because it is best adapted to preserve the purity of her doctrines, but because it bears upon it the sacred seal of God's authority.

To these principles they ask the attention of the world. They say, let them be examined by their own light, and the light of revelation. The very announcement of them is adapted to carry a conviction of responsibility to every man's bosom, and to lead each to think and act for himself, feeling, that while he lives in impenitence, he holds no special relation to God, on which his conscience can repose. They think, that these principles are the same as those preached by the Apostles, the same as those held in different ages by various communities of Christians, who acknowledged not the dominion of the Romish church; the same as those maintained by their own Roger Williams, the champion of religious liberty, who sought to secure them an asylum on the shores of Rhode Island, amid winter's cold and tempest's blasts, and persecution still more relentless than a winter's sky, or 'the pelting of the pitiless storm.' Though they are more clearly seen and honored now than they were formerly, yet they remain too much in the shade. If they shall ever be brought fully out to light, and allowed their legitimate sway, we believe that era will be the precursor of the universal triumph of primitive Christianity."—HAGUE.

A FAMILIAR CONVERSATION

ON

BAPTISM AND COMMUNION.

Baptist.—Good morning, my dear brother. It is with much pleasure I am permitted to meet you. Walk in and take a seat. * * * I observed you at our meeting last evening. How were you interested in the exercises?

Pedobaptist.—Very much. The liberal manner in which the meeting was conducted, afforded me much pleasure. It was truly interesting, to see the members of different evangelical denominations, take part in the exercises. It was an *emblem* of what I anticipate will take *place* in Heaven.—After I returned home last evening, while meditating upon the Christian catholic feelings, which were *exemplified* by the members of your church, in the conference room, I was reminded of the hard names, and opprobrious epithets, which have been so profusely poured out upon your denomination. And I involuntarily said to myself, is it possible, that a denomination, so liberal and social in their meetings, are as *bigoted*, *unchristian*, and *illiberal* in their *views*, as they have been represented. May it not be, after all, that *these statements* are, in a great measure, exaggeration. And then I resolved, that in the morning I would avail myself of the opportunity to call on you, and hear what you might have to say in defence of your “*sect*,” which I presume you are conscious is “*every where spoken against*.” Now, if you are not engaged this morning, I should like to converse with you on your distinguishing sentiments, and endeavor to ascertain how far our views harmonize, and the precise points in which we differ with regard to our religious tenets.

Baptist.—As I have no engagements this morning, it will afford me pleasure to sit down with you and canvass our views and sentiments, and scan them by the Word of God—the Law and the Testimony. And here, I would remark, that if we intend to ascertain what is truth—what the Bible teaches, it is of the utmost importance that we lay aside the *pride* of intellect, all party zeal, every favorite preconceived opinion, and “the wisdom of this world,” and approach the SACRED WORD, not with the torch of human philosophy, saying what is consistent or inconsistent with reason;—not with a dictatorial spirit, saying what it ought to teach and what it ought not teach; but with “our minds characterized by that childlike humility, so beautifully described” by our Savior, and so sacredly enjoined as an *indispensable* prerequisite to the reception of truth; and in the absence of which, no man can even hope to enter the kingdom of heaven. In this respect, the same laws govern the natural, as the moral world. Thus it was with Sir Isaac Newton, when his mind was clothed with childlike simplicity, “nature held communion with him as with a favorite son.” To him she unfolded the laws that govern the material world, “and, taking him by the hand, she led him over the wide expanse of universal being.” In like manner, Jesus Christ “reveals himself to *him* who is of a humble and a contrite spirit,” “as he does not to the world;” and “opens his eyes to behold wondrous things out of his Law.” Now, would we discover the laws that Jesus Christ has instituted for the *constitution and government of his church*, it is evident that the speculations of genius and philosophy must give place to that deep humility of heart, which alone will induce us to search the Sacred Oracles with a diligent, prayerful spirit, asking wisdom of *Him*, “in whom are hid all its treasures,” (and who has promised to bestow it liberally on all who ask for it,) that we may, in this prescribed manner, be enabled to discover the *mind and will* of Christ; and obtain that disposition of heart which will lead us to “walk in all His commandments and ordinances blameless.” In this manner may we hope to obtain that blessing, which is pronounced upon those “who follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth.”

“This, as I presume you are aware, is not a subject of trifling importance, inasmuch as it involves the purity and prosperity of the church, designed by our Lord to represent his kingdom here on earth,—to exhibit to the world something of its order and harmony, and the purity and excellency of its principles, and instrumentally to carry forward his designs of mercy, un-

til his name and his praise shall be one in all the earth." Here, let it be remembered, that Infinite Wisdom has in no sense invested man with a *discretionary power*, which authorizes him to alter any of the laws, instituted by Christ for the constitution and government of *His church*, HIS SPIRITUAL KINGDOM on earth, however celebrated he may be for learning, or eminent for piety.

Let us both pledge ourselves to each other, and to Him who died for us, that we will submit our sentiments and views to the *oracles of Divine Truth*, fully determined in the strength of the Lord that we will renounce every sentiment; that is not in conformity to the requirements of Christ, let it cost whatever self-denial it may. Should we finally be so happy as to enter heaven, probably we shall then see things as they are, "which is the sublimest thing in nature." We shall then receive no satisfaction in discovering, that we permitted "our mental vision to be obscured by passion or prejudice" for the want of that thorough, impartial examination which it is the duty of all to make. Surely, no satisfaction can then arise from the consciousness that we, through sheer neglect of investigation, have thus thrown the "weight of our influence, or any part of it, into the scale of error, either in principle or practice. If we shall derive satisfaction from any thing we shall have done on earth, it will be for our having diligently and prayerfully sought for the truth and closely adhered to it."

Pedobaptist.—Your remarks I deem very appropriate, and pledge myself most sacredly, to renounce every religious sentiment, not authorized by the word of God; and bow with deep humility to his commandments, and to Apostolical example. Now, as it is much easier to ask than answer questions, with your permission I would like to throw the laboring oar on you.

Baptist.—I shall not complain of taking it my part of the time, and will endeavor to use it as skilfully as possible.

Pedobaptist.—Do the Baptist denomination believe, with the Pedobaptist, that *baptism is an indispensable prerequisite* to communion at the Lord's Table?

Baptist.—Oh yes!

Pedobaptist.—It would gratify me to hear what authority and evidence you have to support this belief.

Baptist.—The precepts of Christ and the example of the Apostles.—The great Law of the commission runs thus: "Go ye forth, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," etc.

From this commission, it is evident that after baptism, our Lord enjoined an observance of all things whatsoever he had commanded; and as he had previously commanded the celebration of the Lord's Supper, it is obvious that *that* was to follow baptism. And indeed we learn from scripture, that the Apostles thus understood the commission; for the first time Peter preached under its authority, he commanded his hearers to "repent and be baptized;" and afterwards "with many *other* words did he testify and exhort."

It is also plain from scripture, that the people so understood the Apostles, for the narration says, "They that gladly received his word, were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in *breaking of bread*, and in prayers."

Thus the primitive disciples first gladly received the word—then were baptized—then were added to the church—then continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in *breaking of bread*, etc. Thus Paul first believed, then was baptized, then assayed to join himself to the disciples.

From my examination of this subject, I am fully convinced that the ancient churches all practised upon the belief, *that baptism is a prerequisite* to the Lord's Supper. I shall select but a *few* of the multitude of testimonials to this universally received opinion.

Justin Martyr says, "This food is called by us, the *Eucharist*; of which it is *unlawful* for any to partake but such as believe the things that are taught by us to be true, and *have been baptized*."

Dr. Wall. *No church ever gave the communion to any persons before they were baptized. Among all the absurdities that were ever held, none ever maintained that, that any person should partake of the communion before he was baptized.*

Dr. Doddridge. It is certain, that as far as our knowledge of primitive antiquity reaches, *no unbaptized person* received the Lord's Supper * * * *How excellent soever* any man's character is, he must be baptized before he can be looked upon as completely a member of the church of Christ.

With these, agree the testimonies of St. Austine, Lord Chancellor King, Benedict Pictet, Dr. Gill, etc.

These testimonies place it beyond a doubt, that the ancient churches practised upon the belief that *baptism is a prerequisite to the Lord's Supper*. And all modern churches, with but few exceptions, practice upon *the same belief*.

Pedobaptist.—The authorities you have produced, are very satisfactory; and so far I perfectly *coincide* with you. Indeed such a coincidence of opinion, as you have adduced between the precepts of Christ and the practice of the Apostles, and primitive christians, and of the christian church in every age; are *conclusive evidence* that *Baptism* is a *prerequisite* to the Lord's Supper. Hence, it follows that no *unbaptized person* has either *precept* or *example* in the New Testament, or in the *practice* of the ancient church, to justify him in coming to the Lord's Table. And, consequently, *no church* has any authority for inviting such. Now since we are so well agreed respecting the prerequisites to the Lord's Table, what is the reason you will not commune with me?

Baptist.—We have communed with each other this morning in our christian intercourse, as our views have been thus far characterized by perfect harmony. Last evening, we communed together in “the mutual disclosures of our hopes and fears, our joys and sorrows, our prayers and exhortations,” and in affectionately endeavoring to aid each other onward in the divine life.

Pedobaptist.—You do not understand me: I mean why do you not commune with me in the celebration of the Lord's Supper?

Baptist.—Have you ever been baptized? And if so, at what age and in what manner?

Pedobaptist.—I *have been informed* that I was baptized in my infancy, by sprinkling.

Baptist.—Now, my dear brother, I presume you are aware that our denomination do not regard sprinkling as Christian Baptism, nor even the immersion of an unconscious infant.—No, nothing short of the immersion of a believer in water. And you know the result of our investigation ended in the full conviction, that no *unbaptized person* had a right to approach the Lord's Table. And that no church was authorized by the Law of Christ, the example of the Apostles, or the practice of the ancient church, to invite such to his Table. Now as we do not consider you baptized, the reason is obvious, why we do not invite *you* to a participation with us at the Lord's Table.—Were we to do this with our present views of what constitute christian baptism, we should effectually veto the principles which we hold in common with your denomination, viz: *that baptism is a prerequisite to communion.*

Pedobaptist.—What reasons or evidences have you for not believing us baptized, or rather for not believing in infant baptism?

Baptist.—Before proceeding directly to answer this query, I shall make a few preliminary remarks on order.

“Order,” my brother, “is heaven’s first law.” The whole planetary system obeys the certain, definite, and fixed laws of its Creator, and this fact, in a satisfactory manner, accounts for that *order and harmony* in their movements, so frequently observed by the astronomer, as they “wheel (in their orbits) unshaken through the void immense,” causing “all the sons of God to shout for joy.” Now this consummate *order* and *harmony* is the result of two opposite combined forces, the *centrifugal* and *centripetal*. Should we give to one of these a *controlling* influence, “planets and suns would run lawless through the sky,” world would be wrecked on world, disorder, desolation and chaos would then ensue. Without order, the beauties of the moral as well as the physical “creation would be annihilated,” the bands of society would be burst asunder, social intercourse would cease to be conducted on the principles of order and justice, anarchy and confusion would reign throughout society. Again, order in the religious world is as beautiful and essential as it is in the natural and moral. Without it here, the religion of Jehovah would be stripped of its pristine beauty and glory, and consequently of the power it was destined to exert over the minds of men. “There must be some defect in our mental vision, if religion does not appear to us most lovely and beautiful, dressed and adorned as she descended from heaven.” Shall *we* then, who are *finite*, attempt to alter and improve the robe placed upon her by Infinite Wisdom?

Now, it is evident, to an impartial observer, that just in proportion as the Laws ordained to govern, either the physical, moral, or intellectual world, are obeyed, in that proportion does order and harmony prevail in each of those spheres.

“Let all things be done decently and *in order*,” says Paul; and in this way only, I apprehend, “we shall honor God and the religion we profess.”

Permit me to “illustrate this sentiment by sacred history.” “It was the duty of the Jewish Priests to offer sacrifices at the temples, but it was their duty to wash or bathe themselves first. It was not their duty to offer sacrifices unwashed;—it would be sin to do it.”

“It was the duty of all Israel to march in a *prescribed order*, not in any other order, nor in disorder; it would be sin to do it.”

“It was the duty of Moses to erect the Tabernacle in the wilderness; but, saith Jehovah, ‘according to all I shall show thee after the pattern of the Tabernacle, and the pattern of all

the institutions thereof, even so shall ye make it;—it would be sin to make it otherwise.”

“All the ordinances of the gospel are binding upon all men.” But it is evident that the *prescribed order* in which these institutions of the gospel are commanded to be observed, (in the commission,) is the *order*, in which *every man* is bound to observe them, or else he violates the Law, and consequently sins. Hence it becomes a question of no ordinary importance, what is the *order of these institutions*. This can be easily ascertained by referring to the commission, as given by Matthew and Mark. You will find by this commission that faith and discipleship was first enjoined, then baptism, &c. *This order* was observed in the practice of the Apostles. Hence we have “an inspired explanation of that Law.” Indeed, “we possess in the Gospels, the Acts and the Epistles—*an accumulation of evidence*” bearing directly on this point, which it would seem that no christian, in his right mind, could possibly reject. This is not bold, unwarranted assertion. For it will be perfectly obvious to any one, who will impartially examine the New Testament, that it was the uniform practice of the Apostles to require a profession of faith before baptism. For example, on the day of Pentecost, it is said, “they that gladly received his word were baptized.” (Now faith is a cordial reception of the truth,) and it appears, by the record, that the Apostles had ample evidence of their belief. Again, when the Eunuch, asked for baptism, “Phillip said, if thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest.” This profession, I think, we may safely conclude is a fair specimen of what the Apostles required of all whom they baptized. Again, it is said that many of the Corinthians, believing (or giving evidence of belief) were baptized. In like manner the Phillipian jailer, Saul of Tarsus, and the Samaritans, expressed their belief before baptism. So, in all the other cases, it was usually expressed or implied. Hence you perceive, that our main evidence, that *faith* is a *prerequisite* to baptism, is derived from scripture facts,—“the law and the testimony.”

Now, if this evidence adduced from scripture, is not sufficient to show that Faith is an indispensable pre-requisite to baptism, then the evidence produced from scripture to show that Baptism is an indispensable pre-requisite to the Lord's Supper, is also deficient. Hence it follows, as inevitably as any demonstration in Euclid, that these two positions must stand or fall together—both being supported by the same evidence. And since you have admitted that the evidence adduced to prove the latter position, has shown that it rests on a solid founda-

tion, it follows that the *same evidence* must (even to your own mind,) show the former to rest on the same foundation. Now if faith in the subject be an indispensable pre-requisite to baptism, as I believe it has been abundantly shown from the Bible, then infant baptism in Apostolical times could not have been a child of the same heavenly household. But, my friend, in your reply to this, it is presumed you will give us your warrant for infant baptism.

Pedobaptist.—Why truly, my friend, though you have occupied some time, I have listened with interest to your remarks and illustrations on order, and I deem them very appropriate, as they exemplify the importance of yielding implicit obedience to the *prescribed order* of all God's commands. But in your answer to the query I proposed, you have been rather logical, still I have been unable to detect any sophistry in the argument.—It seems the part of candor to acknowledge here, that your answer has somewhat shaken my belief, that infant baptism is authorised by the great commission.

But as I do not see how the argument can be completely invalidated, I shall advance it. Our Savior in his last command, said “Go teach all nations, baptizing them, etc. Now is it not self evident that infants are included in the expression “all nations”? and if so, what better warrant can we have? But why do you smile?

Baptist.—Why really, my brother, I cannot help it. If the expression “all nations” be a good warrant for baptizing infants, then we have equally as good for baptizing “impenitent adults and all sorts of human beings,” for they are included in the expression “all nations.”

“According to this, the Catholics were right, in teaching the Indians of South America to say the creed and the Lord's prayer, and baptizing them by hundreds and thousands. But read the whole commission,—remember that the word rendered ‘teach’ is admitted by all to mean ‘disciple,’—that discipleship and faith are mentioned prior to baptize, and the inference will be very different. Look at the practice of the Apostles, and see how they understood the commission, and there need be no doubt about its import.” “Can any thing be plainer than that this law of the commission authorizes the baptism of believers?”

Pedobaptist.—But it is plain, my friend, that “the directions of Christ here refer only to those who are capable of believing, and the language does not forbid the baptism of infants.”

Baptist.—It is true “these directions command none but

believers to be baptized," and we shall probably see good reasons for this, if we find room in this tract, to examine the spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom, as well as the import and design of baptism. "But further, the terms of the commission, while they enjoin the baptism of believers, do, most certainly, exclude the baptism of any but believers." Suppose that I have a farm I wish to stock, and commission my agent to purchase for me a number of red milch cows. Now this agent, instead of purchasing exclusively the kind and color of cows mentioned in his commission, purchases some black cows and some that were not milch—some calves, etc. I ask now, if he does not violate his instructions? But when I inquire of him why he purchased calves, black cows, etc., he replies, the color is "*non-essential*," and there is no clause in the commission that interdicts it. I inquire, is not the *color* essential to obedience? Have you any authority for doing thus? He replies none: but adds, you did not direct me *not* to buy them. Nor was it necessary, I rejoin. When you received your commission for purchasing cows of *a certain description*, you were as really forbidden to purchase cows of any other description, on my account, as if I had said, in so many words, buy red milch cows and do not purchase any others. You might as well have purchased for me horses, and urged that the above words of your commission do not prohibit it! In doing as you have, you have acted without authority and against my instructions, and you must abide the consequences. In like manner, the commission given by our Savior,—"*directs his ministers to baptize believers and them only.*" *Mentioning none but believers, it virtually excludes all others.* To administer the ordinance to any others, is to act without the authority of Christ, and against his instructions. Yea more, if there were another commission requiring infants to be baptized, it could not abolish the commission now under consideration, which requires all men to be baptized on believing the gospel.

"*The command of Jesus to every believer to be baptized, stands engraven in indelible characters in his commission. It cannot be effaced, and I call on you and all believers on their allegiance to the Son of God, to submit to this ordinance of his kingdom.*" It seems to me, that no believer, in good health, can urge any thing like a reasonable excuse for neglecting, or disobeying *so plain a command.*

If any thing more were wanting to satisfy us respecting the subjects of baptism, we have it in the concluding direction of the commission, "Teaching them," &c. "The candidate is sup-

posed to be old enough to be taught the other institutions of the Gospel. Unconscious babes of course are excluded." Our views of this subject are agreeable to those of many pious and learned Pedobaptists.

Grotious. "Christ properly requires teaching the first elements of christianity as PRECEDING BAPTISM which also was always used in the church previous to that ordinance."

Jerome, the most learned of all the Latin Fathers, says: "They FIRST TEACH all nations; then WHEN they are taught, they baptize them in water, for it cannot be that the body should receive the sacrament of baptism, unless the soul has before received true faith."

Calvin. "Because Christ requires teaching before baptizing, and will have believers only admitted to baptism, baptism does not seem to be rightly administered, except faith precede."

Baxter, speaking of the commission. "This is not like some occasional, historical mention of baptism, but it is the very commission of Christ to his Apostles for preaching and baptizing; and purposely expresseth their several works in their several places and order. Their first task is, by teaching to make disciples, which by Mark are called believers. The second work is to baptize them. The third work is, to teach them all other things, which are afterwards to be learned from the school of Christ. TO CONTENTN THIS ORDER, IS TO RENOUNCE ALL RULES OF ORDER; for where can we expect to find it, if not here? I profess my conscience is fully satisfied, that there is one sort of faith, even saving, that must go before baptism."

Pedobaptist.—The evidences that you have produced, from scripture and history, to support *believer's baptism*, is quite satisfactory,—indeed, I am very willing to admit, that the Apostles baptized believers. and that the commission enjoined it.—But then, *we* believe, that, as there is nothing in the New Testament that explicitly prohibits infant baptism, the silence of the scriptures must be in favor of the rite. Why do not your denomination practice it?

Baptist.—Why, my friend, do you again bring forward the *silence* of the scriptures to prove infant baptism? I thought, really, that my reply had annihilated this position.—Have you actually *no better evidence from Scripture* than *silence* to prove the lawfulness of this rite? How different were the reasonings of Paul! He proves that the tribe of Judah had nothing to do with Aaron's priesthood, from the *silence* of Moses: "*of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood.*" "The New Testament does not forbid infant baptism." *Neither does it forbid the admission of infants to the Lord's Supper*, nor the invocation of Saints, nor the sprinkling of holy water, nor the use of salt and spittle, nor the saying of mass for the repose of the dead, nor indeed, *all the paraphernalia of Popery*. "But does this *silence* prove that these superstitions are lawful, and should be observed?" If so, "*what a wonder working power this silence is!*"

Again, the *reason* why we do not baptize *infants*, is because the Apostles baptized *believers*, and there is no evidence from scriptures that they *ever baptized any except believers*. Again, should a man, who did not believe baptism a *prerequisite* to

communion, ask me why we admit *none* to the Lord's Supper but *baptized persons*, I should advisedly, reply, because the Apostles communed with *baptized persons*; and there is no evidence from Scripture that they ever communed with any who were *not baptized*. It seems to me that this argument alone is sufficient to condemn *infant baptism*. Here I take my stand on the *very ground* of Christ's commands, and the Apostles' example; and, unless it can be shown from Scripture that the Apostles baptized *without a profession of faith*, or communed with *unbaptized persons*, I must still regard *faith* as a *prerequisite* to baptism; and *baptism* as a *prerequisite* to the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and consequently *must reject all baptism except believer's*, as unchristian; not being authorized by the *Law of Christ*, nor the example of the inspired Apostles, which is a complete explanation of that law. Again, it should be remembered that the *only evidence we have from Scripture*, that *baptism* is a *prerequisite* to church membership, is *the example of the Apostles* in the constitution of the primitive churches,* and *this* is deemed sufficient by all denominations. Now, that *faith* is a *prerequisite* to baptism, we have not only the testimony of *Apostolical example*, but in addition to this, we have the *express precepts of Jesus Christ*. "Such being the fact, our assurance is *doubly sure* that we are on the side of **TRUTH**. It seems to me that this subject is so plain, that "he who runs may read, and he who reads may understand."

Pedobaptist.—To be honest, my friend, your illustrations have convinced me that *silence* cannot prove infant baptism to be a *divine requirement*, for if it could, it would also prove, (as you have shown,) that all the *penances* of the Romish church are *divine requirements*. And, still farther, your arguments have compelled me to abandon, as untenable, the idea that infant baptism can be found in the commission. But the examples of the Apostles I believe you have admitted as good authority, and *they*, you are aware, *baptized certain households*, and it is altogether probable that these households contained infant children.

Baptist.—"Probably they contained infant children; but that is begging the question, which, to avail you any thing, must be made certain. *The burden of proof rests on you*. The mere expression, *baptized households*, will avail nothing till you prove not only that they *might* contain, but that they *actually did contain infants*† and that the infants were actual-

* From Scripture we learn that the church at Jerusalem, and also that at Corinth, were composed of **BAPTIZED BELIEVERS**.—Acts.

† When households are mentioned it must be shown also, to avail any thing, that all the members of the family are included in scripture language: but "a man's foes are they of his household"—surely not infants.

ly baptized. This I am confident you will not *attempt*; for the spirit of inspiration has left on record facts concerning two of these cases, which prove conclusively *that they contained only those who believed.*

Let us examine these household baptisms. It is said respecting the jailers' household, that Paul and Silas "spake unto him the word of the Lord, and *to all that were in his house*; and he rejoiced, believing in God with all his house."

Dr. McKnight, a pedobaptist, remarks: "The house of the jailer, it seems, *were equally impressed with Paul's sermon as the jailer himself was.*"

Calvin — "in which the grace of God suddenly * * brought the **WHOLE FAMILY** to a pious consent."

Bloomfield. "It is taken for granted, *"his family become Christians as well as himself."*

Concerning the household of Stephanus, Paul writes: "It is *the first fruits* of Achaia, and they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." On which Dr. McKnight remarks, "The family of Stephanus *seem all to have been adults when they were baptized*, as they are said to have devoted themselves to the ministry of the saints."

With reference to the case of Lydia, it appears she was a stranger from Thyatira, residing in Phillippi, nearly three hundred miles, for the purposes of trade. The account speaks neither of husband nor children, and there is no evidence that she had either. "Probably her household was composed of assistants in her business, who, following her example, *believed*, and were *baptized*. For we are informed, that when Paul and Silas left the city, they entered into the house of Lydia and saw and comforted the *brethren.*"

Again: when Paul preached in Corinth, Crispus with all his house believed in the Lord. In all these cases there is no mention made of any one being baptized on another's faith.

Thus we find in the New Testament *baptized households* just as often as we find *believing households*. "As we happen to belong to a household," all of which, including twelve children, have been baptized on a profession of their own faith, the inference, *because* that the Apostles baptized households, they "probably baptized infants, cannot be expected to strike our mind as irresistible;" especially as other such instances are not unfrequent. Within a recent period the missionaries in Burmah speak of baptizing eight entire households of believers. Can you now, my friend, with such evidences before you, find authority for infant baptism in the households mentioned?

Pedobaptist.—Indeed, from the examination of the household baptisms recorded in the New Testament, it seems the part of candor to concede that they furnish no evidence to support infant baptism, but very much believer's baptism. Now, although these household baptisms seem to take part against me, still I am very positive we have authority for infant baptism in the Abrahamic covenant. Baptism has now taken the place of circumcision, and children under that covenant you know were circumcised, hence they should be baptized under the gospel dispensation.

Baptist.—The covenant made with Abraham may be found in Gen. xvii: 1—14. Please turn to it.

Now, my friend, if this is the very covenant God has made with every christian parent, then he is under obligations to perform the rite of circumcision on every man child in his house, and that too on the eighth day, neither before nor after that period.

“But it is said *baptism has come in the place of circumcision*. You assert it, and you must prove it. If we are yet under the covenant of circumcision, only baptism having taken place of the ancient rite, why has not the Bible informed us of the fact? When some, who had embraced the religion of Jesus, (Acts v.) insisted that the christian converts should be circumcised, why did not the great council of the Apostles and Elders, who decided that circumcision was abolished, satisfy *those* who were jealous of the law, by reminding them that the baptism of infants was to be practised as a *substitute* for circumcision?”

But I presume you are aware that only male children and adults were circumcised. Now, if baptism has taken the room of circumcision, it follows that none save males are eligible to receive this rite.

And when Paul wrote to the Gallatians, in opposition to the Judaizing teachers, who held to circumcision, why do we find in his Epistle not a single hint of the same fact? Could the spirit of inspiration have suffered such an opportunity to pass without informing the church that infant baptism had taken the place of circumcision? Had this been done, it would have forever settled the question and ended all further dispute.

Again: on another occasion, (Acts xxi. 17—22,) when Paul made his last visit to Jerusalem, he went in unto James, all the Elders being present, and then gave an account of the wonders God had wrought by his ministry among the Gentiles. And hearing this they glorified the Lord. One of them, immediately appealing to his knowledge of the “*thousands of Jews which*

believe and are zealous of the law," says, that "they are informed by thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying they ought not circumcise *their* children." Paul is here charged with teaching his Jewish converts to neglect circumcision. Now had he taught them to *baptize* their children, as a *substitute*, was he not imperiously called upon to declare it in self-defence. But the utter silence of the Apostle, when thus pressed by his Jewish brethren, is irresistible evidence to my mind that *infant baptism* at that time was *unknown*.

Again, circumcision was administered to adults without requiring faith or repentance as a qualification. But there is no instance left on record of any (except christians) being admitted to baptism, without giving evidence of possessing both. As I have already said more on this head than I intended, I shall only add that the most eminent biblical scholars of the age agree with Professor Stuart, in the opinion that "*the Abrahamic covenant furnishes no ground for infant baptism.*"*

Pedobaptist.—And now, my friend, I must acknowledge my disappointment in not finding any warrant in the Abrahamic covenant for infant baptism. From the examination and remarks made, I feel myself compelled to abandon it in despair, and coincide with Professor Stuart's views. But though this covenant furnishes no authority for the rite, still "in the christian church from its earliest ages, and we think from the Apostles' time, it has been the custom to baptize the infant children of professing christians. In proof of this, I might cite a passage from Justin Martyr's apology, and another from Irenæus, &c. I presume you are acquainted with the passages; if so, I should like to hear what you have to say on them.

Baptist.—Now I am quite ready to grant, that if infant baptism can, by authentic records, be traced back to the Apostles' time, you have good authority for the practice of it. But I am sure this cannot be done. Had you either precept or example for it in the New Testament, it would be established beyond a doubt. But that these are wanting, is conceded by some of the ablest Pedobaptist writers, many of whom admit, with Dr. Woods, that "we have no express precept or example for infant baptism in all of our sacred writings." "Commands, or plain and certain examples in the New Testament relative to it," (infant baptism,) says Professor Stuart, "I do not find." Bishop Burnet says, "there is no express precept or rule given in the New Testament for the baptism of infants."

* Manuscript Lectures, Gal. 3.

Martin Luther says, "It cannot be proved by the sacred scriptures, that infant baptism was instituted by Christ, or begun by the first christians after the Apostles." Neander says, "That Christ did not establish infant baptism, is certain." Similar admissions are made by Bishops Prideaux, Sanderson, Stillingfleet, by Limborch, Erasmus, Witsius, and the most celebrated writers of England and the continent.

As we intend to make some quotations, from the German authors, in regard to *infant baptism*, justice to them seems to demand that we should here state, "that while they in general deny, that infant baptism was introduced by Christ or by his apostles, they still justify the practice on the ground of analogy or expediency. So far, however, from being agreed in what the true reason for this practice consists, they differ so widely as mutually to destroy each others foundation." As we have not room here to introduce their views we would only remark, that "with the various theories of infant baptism, not resting on apostolical practice, we have, at present, nothing to do. Our single object, in introducing the testimony of these critics is, to prove this one historical fact, that infant baptism was not practised by the apostles." We shall select only a few of the multitude of examples, that might be adduced.

"We will proceed to our purpose," by introducing the testimony of the great Schleiermacher, who, in his *Christian Theology*, p. 383, pungently, if not indignantly, remarks: "All traces of infant baptism, which one will find in the New Testament, MUST FIRST BE PUT INTO IT." He calls it "a departure from the original institution, and yet he defends it on other grounds." He furthermore says, "Our symbolical books (i.e. the creeds) treat of it without regard to history, and attempt to justify it in itself; but the manner in which they do it, is unsatisfactory, and upon grounds that essentially destroy each other."

Prof. Hahn's *Theology*, p. 556: "According to its true original design, it can be given only to ADULTS, who are capable of true knowledge, repentance and faith. Neither in the Scriptures, nor during the first hundred and fifty years, is a sure example of INFANT BAPTISM to be found; AND WE MUST CONCEDE; THAT THE NUMEROUS OPPOSERS OF IT CANNOT BE CONTRADICTED ON GOSPEL GROUND." Few men stand so high in public estimation for piety, sense and learning, as Prof. Hahn, of Breslau. In another passage, he adds: "It arose from false views of original sin, and of the magical power of consecrated water."

Winer's *Manuscript Lectures*: "Originally only ADULTS were baptized; but, at the end of the second century, in Africa, and in the third century generally, infant baptism was introduced; and in the fourth century, it was theologically maintained by Augustine."

Corrodi. "At the time of Christ and his disciples, only adults were baptized; therefore, among christians at the present day, not children, but adults, who are capable of professing Christianity, ought to be baptized."

Prof. Lange, in his recent work on *Infant Baptism* observes: "All attempts to make out infant baptism, from the New Testament, fail. It is totally opposed to the spirit of the apostolical age, and to the fundamental principles of the New Testament."

Matthies, one of the latest writers on baptism, says: "In the first two centuries, no documents are found, which clearly show the existence of infant baptism at that time."

Dressler. "In the New Testament, it is no where mentioned, that the children of Christian parents were baptized; the consecration by baptism, always relates to those only whose faith was changed, and who were made acquainted with Christ and became his disciples."

Von Coln. "Exorcism was practiced in early times only with demoniacs; then it became a catechetical preparation; and, after INFANT BAPTISM WAS INTRODUCED, it was a part of the baptismal rite."

Hase's Theology: "Baptism obligates a man to a Christian life; but how can one who is unconscious, obligate himself to any thing?"

Hutter's Redivivus. "The imputation of the parent's faith to their children, must be laid aside as an *opus operatum*" (i. e. a mere form).

Baumgarten Crusius, Hist. of Theology: "Infant baptism can be supported neither by a distinct apostolical tradition, nor apostolical practice."

Bretschneider, in his Theology, observes: "Rheinhard, Morus and Doderlein, say, infant baptism is not to be found in the Bible." We need say nothing of the literary character of these three great men.

Kaiser's Bib. Theology. "Infant baptism was not an original institution of Christianity. When it is said of Lydia, that she was baptized with her whole house, it evidently means only those who were capable of it, or who believed. In Acts 18: 8, it is said, that the baptized household had BELIEVED. The first traces of infant baptism are in the second century."

Prof. Lindner of Leipsic, on the Supper, says: "Christian baptism can be given only to adults, not to infants. The Holy Spirit, which is given only to believers, was a prerequisite to baptism."

Gesenius, being informed, in conversation, that the Baptists of America reject infant baptism, and baptize only adults, on profession of faith, replied: "that is perfectly right, that is according to the Bible."

Now it should be remembered here, that these are some of the most eminent Pedobaptist theologians, and that their testimonies militate against their own practice. What, I would ask, but a deep conviction of TRUTH would have induced them to make these concessions? These admissions from you own writers I presume you will admit as good evidence, that infant baptism had no existence in Apostolical times. Here I might rest the whole argument; for if it cannot be proved that Christ instituted it, or that the Apostles practised it, then those who practice it, do it without any scripture authority, and of course they *must abandon* the fundamental principle of every Protestant, that the Bible alone is our rule of faith and practice.

But I proceed to notice the case of Justin Martyr, who, speaking of many of the aged members of the church, "some sixty, some seventy years old," says, they "were made disciples to Christ from their infancy."

"It is worthy of note here, that the Greek verb employed is the same as that rendered teach [Ematheteusan] in the commission." Matthies, commenting on this passage, says, "these words mean simply, THAT FROM THEIR CHILDHOOD THEY WERE INSTRUCTED IN RELIGION." For, in another place, speaking of the order and manner of baptism, Justin Martyr says, "that only those who believed what they were taught were baptized." From which it appears, that in Justin's view, "baptism was to be given subsequent to faith."

Starck says, "The defenders of infant baptism attempt to prove it from Justin Martyr and Irenæus, *but neither of them says what is attributed to him.*"

Neander, Winer, Rheinhard and Munscher, Hahn, Lange, and nearly all the German critics, are directly opposed to the Pedobaptist view of this passage.

Baumgarten Crusius, speaking of "The celebrated passage in Irenæus," says, it "*is not to be applied to infant baptism*, for the phrase *renascuntur*, &c. evidently means the participation of all in his divine and holy nature, in which he became a substitute for all."

Winer. "Tertullian is the first that mentions infant baptism, *Irenæus does not mention it* as has been supposed."

"So Rossler, Munscher, Von Coln," &c.

"Hence it appears, that Tertullian, about A. D. 204, is the *very first* writer, christian or pagan, who mentions infant baptism, and *he opposed it*,—"a proof," says Neander, "that *it was not yet customary to regard this as an Apostolic institution*; for had it been so, he would hardly have ventured to oppose it so warmly." Again, Neander says: "Tertullian declared against infant baptism, which at that time was certainly not a generally prevailing practice, * * * for his assertions render in the highest degree probable, it had just begun to spread, and was therefore regarded by many as an innovation."

It should be borne in mind here, that Dr. Neander, of Berlin, Prussia, is a "mighty prince" among the most eminent scholars and critical theologians of Germany. As an ecclesiastical historian he stands unrivalled. The great body of living German critics, are united with him in this view of the subject.

Now, if it be a fact, as I have shown, by a reference to the testimony of some of the most eminent biblical philologists, that infant baptism had no existence in the Apostolic age, it matters not in what other age it may be found, it can have no claims upon our observance, so long as the Bible *alone* is our rule of faith and practice.

Pedobaptist.—From the testimonies adduced, it appears that infant baptism was not practised, until about the close of the second century. But, then what do you do with the testimony of Origen (who flourished not far from the year A. D. 220,) and Augustine, (about A. D. 400;) they testify to an Apostolical tradition for infant baptism.

Baptist.—In regard to the former, Neander says, "His words in that age, cannot have much weight; for whatever was regarded as important, was alleged to be from the apostles. Besides, many walls of partition intervened between this age and that of the apostles to intercept the view."

Augustine, who lived in a more remote age from the apostles, says, "That infant baptism *is believed* to be established, not without apostolical authority." It appears that he was more deeply engaged in controversy, than any other man in the ancient

church, and that what he says, he “states rather as a matter of belief than as an ascertained fact.” Hence we conclude that he *inferred* his facts, and is therefore not a historical witness. According to Mosheim, he exposed himself to the charge of “hastily throwing upon paper thoughts, which he had not himself duly considered.” “What he said of infant baptism he might have said equally as well of infant communion if he had been speaking of that subject.”

Now we learn from history that Augustine himself, though he had a pious mother, was not baptized till he was 33 years of age. Nor was Patricius his father, nor Ambrose who was the means of his conversion, baptized till adult age.

Pedobaptist.—It would seem, from your remarks, that there is no confidence to be placed in the testimonies of Origen and Augustine. But then you know that pious parents feel, that it is a duty that they owe to their Maker, to consecrate their children to God by baptism.

Baptist.—The views which Pedobaptists entertain on this subject, are, in all probability, the legitimate offspring of education, as it is acknowledged that the Bible is silent on the subject. Still the feelings that induce pious parents to present their children for baptism, are, often, deserving of great respect; and I have no doubt they are sincere in the belief, that they are doing their duty. But if feelings are to be our criterion of what is duty, then our puritan fathers, (when they believed that they were responsible, for the correctness of the religious belief of their fellow men,) were doing their duty, and of course *right in whipping, fining, imprisoning, and banishing the Baptists, and in hanging the Quakers*, because they were prompted to these acts, by feelings deserving of great respect, viz. a desire to preserve the church free from heresy, and promote its purity. Then, every voluntary act of man is right, that is prompted by *feeling*, and consequently *nothing* wrong,—a position too absurd to be admitted for a moment. Men must not set up their feelings as a standard, and then attempt to bend the word of God to correspond with them. Our first duty is, to ascertain the will of God, (as revealed to us in the scriptures,) and then to do it.

Pedobaptist.—But you do not believe then in infant dedication?

Baptist.—Oh yes I do, let the parent take the child into his closet, and there, in solemn fervent prayer, dedicate him to God, let this be done not unfrequently, and that too, when the child is old enough to understand, and accompany it with affectionate religious instruction, and thus “train up the child in” “the

nurture and admonition of "the Lord." But do not perform an unauthorized ceremony upon the child, and then teach him, that this is an ordinance of divine appointment. But suppose we were to admit the arguments, urged to sustain infant baptism, as valid,* (and Pedobaptists do practically admit them,) we should open a door that would not only admit all the claims of Episcopacy, but even all the mummeries of Papacy. And the moment we embrace these, we reject the authority of the Bible, and of course launch out into the wide, deep abyss of infidelity, and attempt, with our frail bark, to navigate an unknown sea, amid the thickest fog, without even a *rudder, chart, or compass* for our guide.

Pedobaptist.—You seem to regard infant baptism as a departure from the Bible, and because there is no express warrant for it, conclude it ought not to be practised. Now if nothing be duty from the Bible, without an express command, we would ask, where is your command for family prayer?

Baptist.—Family prayer is a moral duty, and one that does not contravene any other moral duty. It is clearly a duty, "from the express precepts, which cannot be obeyed fully without its performance." "Husbands and wives are commanded to *live together*, as heirs of the grace of life." "And this implies the duty of mutual prayer. They are commanded to bring up their children, in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, to *train them up in the way they should go*,—and this involves the duty of domestic prayer." Hence it is not apposite for you to ask, where is your explicit command for family prayer? Again it is evident, that you have entirely overlooked the distinction between *positive institutions and moral duties*. These last, "such as repentance, faith, justice, benevolence, praise, prayer, may be deduced from the nature and fitness of things," but we are commanded to pray without ceasing. "The spirit of prayer is the prime element of the Christian's life,"—

"The christian's vital breath,
The christian's native air."

"It is designed and adapted to sanctify all the relations [of life] in which we stand."

We do not believe that positive institutions can with propriety be inferred "from the nature and fitness of things;" but

* Vi- tringa has well said: "If it be once granted to the Doctors of the Romish communion, that the order and worship of the Gospel church, are conformable to those of the Jewish economy, (TO WHICH THE PAPISTS ALWAYS LOOK FOR THE CHIEF SUPPORT OF THEIR NUMEROUS ERRORS,) they will plausibly defend the whole of their ecclesiastical polity."

give us a logical inference for infant baptism, drawn from express teaching, and we will admit its force.

Pedobaptist.—I must acknowledge, my friend, that I know of no express teaching in the Bible, from which we can reasonably infer infant baptism. Before this conversation I thought differently, but where is your explicit warrant for observing the Lord's day as the Christian Sabbath?

Baptist.—My dear brother, for the observance of this we have apostolical precedent. Give us such a warrant for infant baptism, and we will acknowledge, that you have good authority for practising it.

Pedobaptist.—But admitting, you have apostolical precedent for keeping the Lord's day. Where, we would like to know is your explicit command for *female communion*?

Baptist.—You might with equal propriety 'demand an explicit warrant for female faith and regeneration, because it is said,' "He that believeth shall be saved;" and, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "The terms used are generic, as well in reference to communion, as to faith and repentance." But it is clear from various passages in the New Testament that women did partake of the communion.* Can you find in the New Testament, as satisfactory evidence in favor of infant baptism? 'I will only add, we do not reject the baptism of infants, merely because there is "no express divine precept requiring it;" but, because there is neither command, nor example, nor fair inference, to be found in its favor in a single passage in the Bible.'

Pedobaptist.—I do not now recollect that the word child is spoken of in connexion with baptism, in the New Testament, but as *it is thought indirectly to be sanctioned by some passages in the New Testament.* I should like to know what you think of them, viz: Matt. xix: 13, 14, and the parallel passages as Mark x: 13—16, and Luke xviii: 15, 16. "Then were brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands on them, and pray: and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said,

* In 1st Cor. 11 chap. from the 1st to the 18th verses, the Greek "word ANER, man, occurs 14 times and the word GUNE, woman occurs 16 times. After speaking of the man and the woman as members of the church; and pointing out their relative duties, the apostle uses the word TIS v. 16, of both genders, referring to both ANER and GUNE; and their uses the pronouns YE and you addressing both genders. As the pronoun stands for the noun, so you represent both man and woman, its antecedents. As often says the apostle as YE, men and women of whom I have been speaking, eat this bread and drink this cup (in the margin) "SHOW YE, (MEN AND WOMEN) FORTH THE LORD'S DEATH TILL HE COME." Here thou is an express precept for female communion. Now for an express precedent. On the day of Pentecost, it is said they continued steadfastly in fellowship, and in breaking bread. It is evident that the pronoun they includes the 120 spoken of in the previous chapter among whom were the women and Mary the mother Jesus, as well as the 3600, but enough. (This note is abridged from A. Campbell)

suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me ; for of such is the kingdom of heaven. And he laid his hands on them" &c.

Baptist.—This passage makes no distinction between the infants of believers, or those of unbelievers, if it favors the baptism of the former, then it must that of the latter ; but it is evident, that it has no allusion to baptism, and "Jesus" you know "baptized not." And again it cannot be proved that the children referred to were infants. In Mark 5 : 39, the same word is used to designate a child 12 years old. It is distinctly said what they were brought to him for, and what ceremony he performed. The English edition of the Polyglott Testament, (New York, 1832.) gives the true sense. "Of such is the kingdom of heaven," (that is, *persons resembling children in disposition ; having their innocence, simplicity, humility, teachableness.*

See Barnes in his note on the place, so Kuinod, Rosenmüller, and Bloomfield.

Pedobaptist.—Your answer is very satisfactory, but then how do you explain the passage 1 Cor. 7 : 14. "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife ; and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband else were your children unclean, but now are they holy."

Baptist.—It is evident that this passage has no allusion to the subject of baptism. It is plain, that the unbelieving husband cannot be so sanctified by the pious wife, as to render him an eligible subject for baptism without faith. The meaning of the apostle, is thus stated by the Rev. John L. Dagg, in a note to Pengilly's Guide to Baptism, as published by the Baptist General Tract Society. "The unbelieving husband is not unclean, so that his wife may not lawfully dwell with him ; the unbelieving wife is not unclean, so that her husband may not lawfully dwell with her. If they are unclean, then your children are unclean, and not one parent in the whole church must dwell with or touch his children until God should convert them." "If this interpretation is correct, this verse is a decided proof that infant baptism did not exist in the days of the Apostles." See Barnes.

Pedobaptist.—There is one more passage, that I have seen brought forward to prove infant baptism ; should like to hear your opinion of that, (Acts 2 : 39.) "For the promise is to you, and your children, and to all that are afar off," etc.

Baptist.—If this promise is made to believing parents unconditionally, then their children are included in the *promise*, whether baptized or not, whether they be the children of believing

Baptists or Pedobaptists. But it is evident that this promise refers not to the covenant of Abraham but to the promise recorded in Joel 2 : 28. (See Barnes and Bloomfield).

Pedobaptist.—Why are the Baptists so opposed to infant baptism, surely it can do the children no harm, if it does them no good.

Baptist.—If infant sprinkling was practised, confessedly as a mere human ceremony, for civil or domestic purposes, it might be, for aught I know, perfectly innocent. But to baptize (sprinkle) an infant in the name of God, “implies that it is done by his command, and under his authority.” But it is acknowledged by Pedobaptist ministers themselves that Christ did not command it, nor the Apostles practise it. Hence it follows that those who practise it do it, without any authority from the Bible. And again it follows, that if there is no authority for it in the Bible, it cannot be a positive Law of Christ, and whoever substitutes it for the positive law of believers baptism, manifestly nullifies or makes void that explicit law of Christ through “a vain tradition.” Now no State in this Union, has a right to make a law, that will contravene any law in the Constitution. To do this would be, not only to disregard the authority of the Union, but to cast a reflection on its wisdom. And has any minister, or church, a right to make a law, (or substitute a mere human tradition as a law,) to contravene or make void an explicit law of Christ, in the Constitution of his spiritual kingdom on earth? To do this, would be a total disregard of the authority of Jesus Christ, as well as a reflection on his wisdom as Lawgiver. Now to me it is clear, that every Pedobaptist minister violates the plain, explicit law of his commission, every time he teaches believing parents, that it is their duty to have their children baptized, (sprinkled) and every time he baptizes (sprinkles) them, because he makes this institution of mere human origin, take the place of the divine institution of believers baptism, (whenever it is in his power,) and thus breaks down the authority of Christ, by “teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” Hear the testimony of the following Pedobaptist writers.

Bishop Butler. “Positive duties do not arise out of the nature of the case, but from external command, received; nor would they be duties at all, were it not for such command received from Him whose creatures and subjects we are.

Dr. Owen.—“Whatever pretends to exceed the direction of the Word, may be safely rejected; cannot be safely admitted.”

Collins.—“Nothing is lawful in the worship of God, but what we have precept or precedent for.”

Baxter, in his Plain Scripture Proof says. “If any should be so impudent, as to say it is not the meaning of Christ that baptism should immediately, without delay follow discipling

they are confuted by the constant example of scripture. So that I dare say this will be out of doubts with all rational, considerate and impartial Christians.

Again he says: "If there be no example given in scripture, of any one that was baptized without the PROFESSION OF SAVING FAITH, nor any precept for so doing, then must we not baptize any without it. But the antecedent is true; therefore so is the consequent. I know of no word in scripture, that giveth us the least encouragement to baptize upon another's faith."

Again: "What man," says he, "dare go in a way, which he hath neither precept nor example to warrant it—from a way that hath a full current of both? Who knows what will please God but himself? Can that be obedience which hath no command for it? O the pride of man's heart; that, instead of being a LAW-OBEYER, will be a LAW-MAKER."

Pedobaptist.—"If you believe Mr. Baxter to be an honest man, how do you reconcile the sentiments contained in these quotations with his practice as a Pedobaptist?"

Baptist.—I do not conceive that it is my duty to reconcile Mr. Baxter's and a multitude of others' views with their practice. How they can believe as they do, that "there is neither precept nor example for infant baptism in the Scriptures," and still remain Pedobaptists, is to me utterly inconceivable, unless I suppose that they came to some such conclusion as Jeremy Taylor, who honestly confesses: "I think there is so much to be pretended against that which I believe to be truth, that there is much more truth than *evidence* on our side." "The only difficulty is, to conceive how, *with such a preponderance of evidence against them,*" these men "should be so unphilosophical as to *believe* that their sentiments are true."

Pedobaptist.—Leaving to eminent Pedobaptists the difficult task of reconciling their concessions with their practice, and having satisfied myself on this subject, I have only to say, that it would be gratifying to me, at least, to hear you recapitulate briefly the ground we have traversed.

Baptist.—Since it has been shown, that the great law of the commission requires faith as a prerequisite to baptism, and consequently does not sanction infant baptism;—since it cannot be proved that there were any infants in the household baptisms mentioned, and even if there were many, it must be admitted, that the circumstances described by the pen of inspiration, show clearly, as Neander has remarked, that "the narrative speaks only of adults or intelligent agents;"*—since it has been shown, that the covenant of circumcision furnishes no ground for infant baptism, as is conceded by Prof. Stuart and the most eminent biblical scholars of the age;—since it is

* All the house of Cornelius FEARED GOD, and RECEIVED THE HOLY GHOST. Lydia's household were COMFORTED AS BRETHREN. The word of the Lord was spoken to ALL in the Jailor's house, and THEY ALL REJOICED, BELIEVING IN GOD, as well as himself. All the house of Crispus BELIEVED ON THE LORD; and the house of Stephanus ADDICTED THEMSELVES TO THE MINISTRY OF THE SAINTS. It must be evident now, that the things affirmed of all these baptized households, cannot be applied to infants. Hence, we must conclude that no infants were baptized in these houses.

admitted by the most eminent Pedobaptist writers, that there is neither precept nor example for it in the Scriptures, and that it was unknown in the apostolical age;—since the voice of history is mute, without whispering even an allusion to infant baptism until the days of Tertullian about A. D. 200;—since the silence of the Scriptures cannot prove it to be an apostolical institution, unless the same evidence will prove that Tertullian lived in the apostolical age;—since it has been admitted, that (in the apostolical age) it could not have been derived from proselyte baptism, it having been decided by the most eminent, modern critics, among whom is Prof. Stuart, that proselyte baptism was unknown among the Jews till after the destruction of the second temple, A. D. 70;—in short, since the most prominent arguments, urged by the ablest writers in favor of infant baptism as a divine institution have been examined and refuted—the Baptists consider the controversy about the subjects of baptism as really settled. They feel themselves constrained in view of the commission, the practice of the apostles and the primitive Christians, to regard infant baptism as an *unscriptural rite*, and to maintain that believers in Christ are the only scriptural subjects of baptism. They appeal to the Bible as *their rule* of faith and practice. They maintain, *that the Bible*, “and not the voice of tradition, or the decrees of councils, or the bulls of Popes—that the Bible, and that alone, is the foundation of Christian faith and practice;” or, in the words of Chillingworth, “The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants.”

Pedobaptist.—You know, that when we commenced our conversation on this subject, I regarded the *infant children of believers* as proper subjects of the rite of baptism, but I am now convinced, that the scriptures furnish no warrant for baptizing infants.—But you remarked, that your denomination believed that immersion only is baptism. As I am perfectly aware that I made a great mistake with regard to the *subjects* of baptism, it would afford me much pleasure to hear you advance what evidence you have to sustain your position, that *immersion*, and that only, is baptism.

Baptist.—I hope you will be patient, while I proceed.

I. THE FIRST ARGUMENT *I shall advance, to prove that immersion only is BAPTISM, is the import of the term Baptizo, the word used to designate the ordinance.*

Baptism is a Greek word, anglicised from *baptisma*, which is derived from *baptizo*, and this verb from its primitive *bapto*,

whose primary meaning is to *dip, plunge, or immerse*. For its secondary meaning it has to *dye*, "a signification growing out of the primary idea, inasmuch as dyeing was originally performed by dipping the thing to be dyed into colouring matter." This word, as Mr. Carson, in his *unanswered* and unanswerable treatises on baptism, shows, was first used to designate *dyeing* by dipping, but, finally, the meaning was so extended, that it denoted dyeing in any manner." It is worthy of note here, that *bapto*, only in its primary meaning, modifies *baptizo*. "This is apparent, from the fact, that *BAPTO* is never applied to the ordinance of baptism, and *BAPTIZO* never signifies to *dye*. *Baptizo* in the whole history of the Greek language, has but one meaning. It signifies to *dip or immerse*, and never has any other meaning." "Each of these words, therefore, has a specific province, into which the other cannot enter; while there is a common province, in which either of them may serve. Either of them may signify to *dip*, generally; but the primitive cannot specifically express that ordinance to which the derivative has been appropriated; and the derivative cannot signify to *dye*, which is a part of the province of the primitive."

That both of these words mean to *dip, plunge, or immerse*, "ALL LEXICOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS OF ANY NOTE, ARE AGREED," says Prof. Stuart.* "If any person is disposed to question this," says Prof. Jewett "he can satisfy himself by examining places in which the words occur in Greek. Out of about *two hundred* passages, taken at random, where these words are employed in their primary and proper sense, the idea is, in every instance, to *dip, plunge, or immerse*. I have already remarked, that, in addition to these significations, *bapto* means to *dye, color, or tinge*; † and *baptizo*, in its *literal* and *proper* sense, never means anything but to *immerse, dip, or plunge*; and when used in a *figurative* application, the figure entirely depends for its force and beauty, on the primary idea of immersion, or plunging. If erroneous, these positions can easily be disproved by a reference to the original classics; but, adding my own labors, to those of the writers whose works I have examined, I have never been able to discover a single passage, which authorizes me to abandon the ground just taken."

* M. Stuart is one of the distinguished professors of the Andover Theological Seminary, Mass., and is, generally, regarded by Pedobaptists, as their ablest Biblical scholar in this country. Every person, who has read Prof. Stuart's Essay on baptism, ought to read the Examination of that Essay by Prof. Ripley, of Newton, or Judd's review, both, triumphant answers, and both written in a "kind christian spirit."

† "The lake was TINGED with blood." Homer's battle of the Frogs,—where *BAPTO*, not *BAPTIZO*, is used.

As a further confirmation of this fact, I would state that Prof. Stuart has quoted passages from the Greek classical authors, Homer, Pindar, Aristotle, Aristophanes, Herodotus, Heraclides Ponticus, Aratus, Zenophen, Plutarch, Lucian, Diodorus Siculus, Plato, Epictetus, Hippocrates, Strabo, Polybus, Josephus, and others, all of whom use the words *bapto* and *baptizo*, to signify immerse. It is worthy of remark here, that Prof. Stuart, throughout the Greek classics and the Septuagint,* assigns to the word *baptizo*, only immerse, overwhelm. Hence, all Greek literature goes to prove that it means immerse. Their poets, philosophers, physicians, historians, and orators, use it only in the sense of immersion, dipping, and never attach to it any other meaning. Not in the whole range of the Greek classics, can it be found to denote any thing else, than to immerse or dip. Again, Prof. Stuart, on page 300, after summing up his citations from the classics, comes to this conclusion. "It were easy to enlarge this list of testimonies to classic usage, but the reader will not desire it. He may see many examples in Carson's recent publication on baptism, which I did not see until after the present dissertation was written. It is impossible to doubt, that the words *bapto* and *baptizo*, have, in the Greek classical writers, the sense of *dip, plunge, immerse, sink, &c.*" But it may be asked here, does not Prof. Stuart show that the Greek classic writers use *baptizo* to signify pouring or sprinkling? I answer no! not a single instance has he adduced from the Greek classics, in which the word is used to denote either to pour, or sprinkle. Indeed, he has said in private conversation, that "it cannot be translated *sprinkle*."† It is, therefore, no cause of wonder, that when Prof. Jewett commenced his investigations of this subject, by reading Prof. Stuart's essay on *baptism* that he "was soon astonished to find in Stuart's investigation, proof, so strong that the word in its literal, ordinary sense, universally means *to immerse, plunge, or dip*." "It looked" says he, as if with this fact before him, the learned Professor ought to have become a Baptist." "I was alarmed," says Prof. Jewett, and "would have given up the inquiry, but could not." Finally after a thorough examination of the subject, he was compelled to admit, as a

* The Septuagint is the Greek version or translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew. It is worthy of remark here, that there are three different words used in the Hebrew to denote the three actions of DIPPING, POURING, and SPRINKLING. *Taval* or *tebel* signifies to dip; *Saphack*, to pour, and *zarak*, to sprinkle. In the Septuagint *EAPTO* or *BAPTIZO* is the representative of *TAVAL*, *CHEO* of *SAPHACK*, and *RAINO* of *ZARAK*.

† See Bronson's examination of Fowler page 228.

philologist and interpreter of the Bible, that *immersion and that only, is the baptism that Christ enjoins.*"

That we have taken a correct view of this subject, viz: That immersion is the exclusive signification of *Baptizo* is frankly acknowledged, by some of the most learned, and eminent Pedobaptists of various denominations. We might with propriety remark here, that the learned world does not afford more competent authority than the following.

John Calvin, the celebrated founder of the Presbyterian church, says: "that baptism was administered by John and Christ by plunging the whole body under water." Again he says: "the word *baptizo* signifies to immerse, and it is certain the rite of immersion was practised by the ancient church."

Witsius.—"It cannot be denied, that the native signification of the words *BAPTEIN* and *BAPTIZEIN*, is to plunge or dip."

Buddaeus.—"The word *BAPTIZEIN* is ALWAYS to be interpreted of immersion."

Alstadius.—"*BAPTIZEIN* signifies ONLY to immerse."

Zanchius.—"The proper signification of *BAPTIZO*, is to immerse, plunge under, to overwhelm in water."

Atlingius.—"For baptism is IMMERSION, when the whole body is immersed; but the term baptism, is NEVER used with respect to sprinkling."

Beza.—"Christ commanded us to be baptized; by which word, it is certain, immersion is signified. To be baptized in water, signifies NO OTHER than to be IMMERSed in water."

Casaubon.—"This was the rite of baptizing, that persons WERE PLUNGED into the water: which the very word *BAPTIZEIN* sufficiently declares."

Mr. Leigh.—"The native and proper signification of it [*baptize*] is to dip into water, or to plunge under water."

Bossuet, bishop of Meaux.—"To baptize signifies to plunge, as is granted by all the world."

Dr. Campbell, late Principal of the Marschale College at Aberdeen, a Presbyterian, the learned translator of the four Gospels with critical notes, says: "The word *BAPTIZEIN*, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies to DIP, to PLUNGE, to immerse. It is always construed suitably to this meaning."

Augusti.—"The word *baptizo*, according to ETYMOLOGY AND USAGE, signifies to IMMERSE, SUBMERGE, &c., and the CHOICE of the word BETRAYS AN AGE in which the LATTER CUSTOM of SPRINKLING had NOT BEEN INTRODUCED."

"Prof. Porson, of the University of Cambridge, and Episcopalian, acknowledged by all competent judges to have been the first scholar in England, pronounced it ABSURD to imagine that [*baptizo*] had any other proper meaning than to dip entirely, to plunge, or immerse."

Martin Luther.—Speaking of children, he says: "They ought to be COMPLETELY IMMERSed, FOR THE ETYMOLOGY OF THE WORD (*BAPTISM*), EVIDENTLY REQUIRES IT." Again, he says: "If you consider what baptism signifies, you shall see the same thing (immersion) required; for it signifies, that the old man of our nativity, that is, full of sins, which is entirely of flesh and blood, may be overwhelmed by divine grace. The manner of baptism, therefore, should correspond to the signification of baptism, that it may show a certain and plain sign of it." "This is a sentiment which well becomes the great Reformer. Had he and his associates consistently carried out the whole principle involved in this expression, the Reformation would have been more complete; they would have cut the last link which bound the Reformed to the Papal church. But alas! they failed here. No wonder, that, when the Baptists in Germany began to agitate this subject, Melancthon said to Luther, "Now the devil has attacked us in our weakest point!"

Having thus shown, that the clear, proper signification of the term *baptizo* is to dip, plunge, immerse, and that many of the most eminent and learned Pedobaptist writers frankly, and explicitly, bear their testimony to the same fact, I cannot avoid the inevitable conclusion, that Jesus Christ INTENDED, (when giving his commission,) to enjoin immersion, or he would never have made choice of the word he did, to designate the ordinance.

But as there are many who will reject this evidence, let us take another view of the subject. Suppose that two divisions of the Greek church, should, unhappily, fall into a dispute, about the legitimate meaning of our English word immerse, and one division should maintain, that the specific import of the term is *baptizo*, *thapto*, to dip, to bury. The other should contend, that the term is generic, and signifies either *cheo*, to pour; *rantizo*, to sprinkle; *nipto*, to wash the hands, face, or feet; *louo*, to wash or bathe the body; or *kathairo*, to cleanse, or *baptize*, to dip, or in fact, it means the application of water in any way. The question that naturally arises now, is this: Can the meaning of this term be ascertained? Who possesses the requisite knowledge to determine its meaning, and thus end the controversy? Why, unquestionably the English, those who use the English language. If they decide that it signifies to dip, to immerge, to bury, and that no other meaning has ever been attached to it as far back as the language can be traced; I ask, would not this, ought not this, to settle the question beyond all reasonable doubt? Would it not be the height of folly, to demur against the decision of so competent a tribunal? Now, where is there a word in any language, that is used generally to denote the action of dipping or immersing, and at the same time signifies pouring, or sprinkling? Where is there a language that ever had a "local habitation," name, or existence, that has not a definite term expressive of the act of immersion? Have the Greeks no term specifically expressive of this act? Can they definitely and exclusively convey the idea of immersion? Most assuredly; for, from the days of Homer until now, they have always "understood the word *baptizo*, to denote the act of immersion, and *rantizo*, to denote the act of sprinkling. And if you strike the words *bapto* and *baptizo* from their vocabulary, they have none more definite to express the act immersion. If this word does not denote it with certainty, then that rich [definite] language is destitute of a *certain* sign to denote this simple common act. Examine such a work as Tittman's Synonymes of the Greek Testament, and you will not find a word placed there, as the equivalent of *baptizo*." I am aware that it may be said here, that Barnes in his note on Mat. 3: 6, says: "the word *baptize*, signifies originally *to tinge, to dye, to stain*;" and, that Dr. Dwight affirms, that "*the body of learned Critics, and lexicographers declare, that the original meaning of baptizo and bapto,*

is to *tinge, stain, dye, or color*; and that when it means IMMERSION, it is only in an occasional and secondary sense.*

Now reader, that, with one view, you may see what a striking contrast there is, between Pedobaptist writers on this subject. We shall again quote the language of Prof. Stuart, who says: "It is impossible to *doubt*, that the words *bapto* and *baptizo* have, in the Greek classic writers, the sense of dip, plunge, immerse, sink." "All lexicographers and CRITICS of ANY NOTE, are agreed in this." Again, throughout the Greek classics and Septuagint, he assigns to *baptizo*, only the sense of *immerse, overwhelm*."† (See page 29th and 30th, of this tract).

Query.—Are Dr. Dwight and and Barnes "CRITICS of ANY NOTE? Who shall decide when Doctors disagree?"

Now the question is, are these contradictory statements true? Does baptize from baptizo signify to *tinge, to dye, to stain*, as affirmed by Barnes and Dwight, or to immerse, overwhelm, as asserted by Prof. Stuart? "Does the *body* of learned critics, make *immersion* a *secondary* and *occasional* meaning of the word? Let us make a little examination of this subject.

We will commence by introducing the testimony of a native Greek.

Stoniza, in a work published in 1810, says: "The Western church has departed from the imitation of Jesus Christ, and has dispeled from view all the sublimity of this external sign. In short, it has done violence both to the word and the idea, in practising baptism by aspersion, the very enunciation of which is a ludicrous contradiction. In truth, the word baptizo immergo (Immerse,) has but one signification. It signifies literally and invariably, 'to plunge.' Baptism and immersion are identical; and to say baptism by aspersion is the same as to say immersion by aspersion, or any other contradiction in terms."

Crysostom, one of the greatest men in the ancient Greek church, explains baptism as being an immersion and then an emersion. And though he speaks of it in innumerable instances in 13 folio volumes, never alludes to sprinkling, but, on the contrary, defines it to be, "a plunging into water and raising out of it," and says, "that we enter into the water a into a grave," and, that "the whole man is completely concealed by immersion."

Theophylact, another of the Greek Fathers, says: "Baptism is performed by three immersions."

The Greek Patriarch Jeremiah, says: "The ancients were not accustomed to sprinkle the candidate, but to immerse him."

* Dr. Cox, in reply to Dr. Dwight's assertion, says: "This is passing strange, and I confess, that the only way in which upon the principles of christian charity, I can account for so untrue a statement, is by concluding, that Dr. Dwight, never examined the authorities." He then refers to several Lexicons, and says: "I demand only a simple inspection of them, as an answer to this strange and erroneous representation."

† Dr. Campbell, when speaking of the fact, that "the baptized are said ANABANEIN, to arise, emerge or ascend, Mat 3: 16, apo tou udatos, and Acts 8: 39, ex tou udatos, from, or out of the water, says: Let it be observed further, that the verbs *raino*, and *rantizo*, used in scripture for sprinkling, are never construed in this manner. When, therefore, the Greek word baptizo (rendered I baptize,) is adopted, I may say, rather than translated into modern languages, the mode of construction ought to be preserved, so far as may conduce to suggest its original import. It is to be regretted, that we have so much evidence that even good and learned men allow their judgments to be warped by the sentiments and customs of the sect they prefer. The true partizan, of whatever denomination, always inclines to correct the diction of the spirit, by that of the party."

Cristopolus, a Greek, in his confession of faith, says: "We follow the example of the apostles, who immersed the candidate under water."

Olearius, in his Persian Travels, says: "The Muscovites call those who are not immersed in baptism 'sprinkled christians,' and therefore rebaptize such as join their church."

Walch, says: "The Greeks regard immersion as essential to baptism, and reject sprinkling."

Augusti.—"The Oriental church has not only preserved unchanged the custom of immersion, but declare it so essential, that they rebaptize those who were only sprinkled, and, by way of contempt, call them 'sprinkled christians.'"

These quotations, with what has preceded, show the invariable sentiment of the whole Greek church. Indeed, where can there be found, at the present day, a learned lexicographer, theological critic, or commentator, that will venture his reputation by the assertion, that the Greek church have not invariably practised immersion as baptism with persons in health? or that immersion is not the primary, radical meaning of baptizo? Now let us turn to the testimonies of some of our modern critics, and then to the lexicographers.

Prof. Fritsche, a disciple of Hermann, in his Com. on Mat. 3: 6, says: "That baptism was performed not by sprinkling, but by immersion, is evident, not only from the nature of the word, but from Rom. 6: 4."

Buttmann, in his largest Grammar, simply puts down, "bapto to immerse" (tauchen).

Brenner.—"The word corresponds in signification with the German word, taufen, to sink into the deep."

The author of Free Inquiry respecting Baptism.—"Baptism is perfectly identical with our word immersion, or submersion (tauchen oder untertauchen). If immersion under water is for the purpose of cleansing or washing, then the word means cleansing or washing."

Bretschneider, in his Theology.—"An entire immersion belongs to the nature of baptism. This is the meaning of the word." This writer is confessedly the most critical lexicographer of the New Testament.

Kaiser, Bib. Theol.—"Bapto is a perfect immersion; Baptizo, to sink nearly to the bottom in water." These are his definitions.

Paulus, in his Com. says: "The word baptize signifies in Greek, sometimes to immerse, sometimes to submerge."

Rheinhard's Ethics.—"In sprinkling, the symbolical meaning of the ordinance is wholly lost."

We will now turn our attention to the testimony of Lexicographers, and commence with the testimony of the excellent Greek and English Lexicon of Dr. John Jones, which gives the plain obvious import of words without refining or accommodating:—(The reader will bear in mind here, that *baptizo* is the only word in the original scriptures, used to designate the rite of baptism, and is the only one, anglicised in our language baptize. Of course if we can discover the true meaning of *baptizo* we shall then ascertain what is essential to the rite of baptism).

1. Jones.—Bapto, I dip; I dye, stain. Baptizo.—I plunge; I plunge in water, dip, bury, overwhelm. 2. Richardson's Lexicon, justly regarded as one of the most valuable ever published,—Baptizo is rendered, to dip, or merge in water, to sink, to plunge, to immerse. 3. Parkhurst.—To dip, immerse, submerge, plunge. 4. Donegan's.—To immerse, submerge, saturate, drench, &c. 5. Schleusner.—To immerse, to plunge, to sink into water. 6. Pickering.—To dip, immerse, submerge, plunge, sink. 7. Hadrian.—To immerse.

The definitions of the remaining ones, we shall give in classes. 8. Buddeus, 9. Conlon, 10. Cole, 11. Plantinus, 12. Stockius, 13. Grove, 14. Xilander, 15. Kopper, 16. Har-

tung, 17. Junius, 18. Gesner, 19. Tusanus, 20. Constantine, 21. Ewing, 22. Schrevelius, improved by Hill, Boyer, and Eutic. The fifteen last Lexicographers give, generally, the following definitions, to dip, to plunge, immerse, wash, and one or two of them add, to sprinkle.

23. "Stephens, 24. Scapula, 25. Suicer in both of his Lexicons. 26. Schleusner, in both; 27. Hedericus, 28. Scheide; 29. Wahl, 30. Bretschneider, 31. Passow, 32. Rost, and others, not only make immersion the primary and radical meaning of the word, but because (qui, daher) it is so, it signifies say they, 'to dye, bathe, wash; (the consequence of dipping,) and one or two of them add, to sprinkle. But it is easy to see, that according to the reason alleged, it must mean, either in reality, or in the conception of the writers who so employ it, to be sprinkled so as to be wet all over."

"Prof. Rost, the principal Greek lexicographer now living, in his standard German Greek Lexicon, revised with the assistance of a native Greek, puts down as the primary signification of all such words as *plunge, immerse, and submerge*, (tauchen, cintauchen, untertauchen,) *bapto*; but, under the words *wash, wet, pour*, and the like, 'waschen, benetzen, giessin, begiessen,' though he gives copious definitions in Greek, he *never* employs the word *bapto*, or any of its derivatives. Can any thing be more to the point."

As we have pursued this examination as far as we design to, with regard to lexicographical testimony, we proceed to inquire what is the testimony given by these eminent Critics, and Lexicographers? Do they all, or even the body of them endorse the assertions of Dwight and Barnes, that the original meaning of *baptizo*, is to tinge, dye, color? No! not even one gives that as the original, primary meaning; and, but a very few give it as a consequential one. Do they all give sprinkling, as the radical primary meaning of the word? No! not one; and there are but two or three, that even mention the term. The same may be said respecting pouring and cleansing. Do they all give *washing*, as the primary, original meaning of the word? Again, the answer is in the negative; and there are but about two thirds of the Lexicons, that give it as a secondary or consequential meaning. Do they all give dip, plunge or immerse, as the primary radical meaning of the word? The answer is now, for the first time, in the affirmative; and there is not a dissenting voice to this, among all the lexicographers and critics we have examined. Indeed, the united, unanimous testimony of the thirty-three Lexicons, [and I am acquainted with no other's,] and all the critics, we have examined [and not one to my knowledge is a Baptist,] goes to confirm the statement of Prof. Stuart. Hence, the statement of Dwight and Barnes, rests on their own *ipse dixit* or assertion, without even a "lexicographer or critic of *any note*," as endorser.

But suppose we admit as truth, the assertions of Dwight and Barnes, "that the primary, original meaning of *Baptizo*, is to tinge, stain, dye, or color." Then it follows, that Christ

commanded his apostles to tinge, stain, dye, or color, his believing subjects; or else, that he used the word out of its ordinary sense, and that too, without even advertising the apostles of the fact. Now if we admit, that he used the word out of its ordinary sense, (and therefore, the Pedobaptists are justified in interpreting it to sprinkle,) then it might, with equal propriety, be admitted, that he used the word *metanoieo*, to repent, out of its ordinary sense, (and therefore, the Papists are justified in translating it *do penance*.) Grant the same liberty to infidels, and they would find no difficulty in proving by the Bible, that there is no hereafter. Indeed, were they now to follow the example of Pedobaptists in the interpretation of this word, they would find no difficulty in proving that all the happiness and misery of man is confined within the narrow boundaries of this life. This argument if we substitute the primitive immersion, for tinge, dye, etc., would be conclusive against sprinkling and pouring.

But it may be asked, why do some of these lexicographers give to *dye*, or *tinge*, as one of the definitions of baptizo. I answer, before Mr. Carson issued his treatise on baptism, both *bapto*, and *baptizo*, were regarded as perfectly synonymous in meaning, but to him belongs the honor of discovering, that the primitive word *bapto*, has two significations, the primary to *dip*, the secondary, to *dye*; and, that *baptizo*, in the whole range of Greek literature, has only the sense of dip, or immerse. Prof. Stuart, notices this distinction, for he has not given to *baptizo*, the sense of to *dye*, while he has, to *bapto*.

It may be asked here, if the Greek *baptizo*, does not signify either to *pour*, or *sprinkle*; why, have two or three of these *lexicons* given this meaning? I reply, a number of these *lexicons* have been written since pouring and sprinkling have come into use; and, I believe, it is a general rule with lexicographers, first, to give the definition of words according to their real import; and then, if a large portion of people use the word in a *new* and different sense, to superadd that. The same question may be raised in regard to *wash* and *cleanse*, but these will be noticed in their proper place.

Now, every person acquainted with the laws of interpretation, will admit, that the primary, radical import of a word, should always be taken as the true one, unless, something in the circumstances of the case, or structure of the passage, absolutely requires another, a different meaning. This is a settled rule of exposition; the purport of which, is adopted by

all interpreters.* Is there any thing in a single passage, in which the ordinance of christian Baptism, is mentioned in the New Testament, that absolutely requires us to depart from this *canon*, by assigning to the term *baptizo* any other than its primary, ordinary import.† Indeed, there are many things, in the sacred record, that teach us, that we are not at liberty to depart from the primitive rite of immersion [baptism]. It is a solemn thing, to alter the word, or the ordinances of God. *Two of the sons of Aaron, in the offering of incense, made a change in a single circumstance, and fire from the Lord destroyed them. Jehovah will be sanctified in them that come nigh him, and before all the people he will be glorified.*

“As the principle of interpretation here involved is of great importance, I may be allowed to illustrate by a familiar example. I give to A. B. a promissory note, payable *on demand*. Now, I am bound to pay the note *whenever presented*; and I cannot plead, that the words ‘on demand,’ should be literally construed; that certain circumstances make it *probable*, they are not used in their ordinary sense. The holder will justly urge, that these words have a definite and well ascertained meaning, and I must satisfy his claim *forthwith*, unless I can show it is *impossible*, that in my case the phrase should be understood according to its usual signification. The burden of proof lies on me, and I must make it evident beyond dispute, that the terms *cannot possibly* have the customary sense, or I I shall be obliged to liquidate the debt.”

“So in the case before us, it is not enough that there are apparent *improbabilities* opposed to the customary use of the term in question; the ordinary force of it must be plainly impossible, or we must retain its usual sense. But no such impossibility exists,” as we have shown by Prof. Stuart.

Finally, it is a self-evident fact, that the *usus loquendi*, that is the practical use of a word among the best writers and speakers of a language, must determine its meaning. This is the source or fountain, to which all lexicographers are obliged to resort, for their knowledge. This is the highest—the only ultimate authority. Now, setting aside the testimonies of lexicographers,

* Mr. Ferguson, a very learned man, says: “If men may be permitted to forsake the natural and genuine sense of words, where the matter is capable of it; they may, notwithstanding their declaring themselves to believe the Gospel, yet believe nothing at all of the christian faith.” “We are not to forsake the genuine and natural signification of words, unless their be the highest evidence, that the author did otherwise intend the u,” saith the civil law. And, as Austin, says: “the proper signification of words is always to be retained, unless necessity enforces us to expound them otherwise.”

† Prof. Stuart, speaking of the circumstances connected with the rite of baptism, in the New Testament, says: “I find none, I am quite ready to concede, which seems absolutely to determine that immersion was not practised.” This is all we ask.

the meaning of *baptizo* can be definitely determined by Greek classical usage, and that, beyond all reasonable dispute; or, it follows, that it is impossible to ascertain the meaning of any word in Greek. "The learned Greeks for two thousand seven hundred years, have decided by *usage*, that the word signifies to dip, to immerse; consequently, it does not mean to pour, or sprinkle." It is utterly futile for any man to attempt to shake this authority, as well might he undertake to level the Aegadines, or "remove the rock of Gibraltar." "Learning, ingenuity, sophistry, great names, positive assertions, are all in vain, when put in requisition for this purpose. After all such impotent attempts, the simple authentic fact, that myriads of Greeks" from the days of Homer, (the oldest profane Greek writer, who flourished more than two thousand seven hundred years since,) "until the present time, have used the word invariably to signify immersion, and figuratively overwhelming, stands out in bold relief before a candid and learned world." Here, then, with this universally acknowledged fact, and the concurrent testimony of so many eminent, learned, and critical standard authors, together with the united testimonies of 33 Greek Lexicons, on the primary, literal meaning of the word, we arrive at the positive conclusion, that immersion is really baptism, which could not actually be the case, if baptism is necessarily any thing else but immersion. We are led, therefore, by classic usage, and the testimonies of critics and lexicographers, to the irresistible conclusion, that baptism is immersion, and nothing else. Now, if baptism is actually immersion (which is admitted by all,) and if sprinkling is actually baptism, then, sprinkling is actually immersion. And who will contend for this ABSURDITY? yet those virtually do, who contend that sprinkling is baptism.

But I proceed to the next proposition.

II. OUR SECOND ARGUMENT IS DERIVED FROM THE FIGURATIVE USE OF THE WORD.

The beauty and force of a figure, can only be seen, as it refers to the literal signification; it is generally used for illustration or emphasis. "In this figurative sense, *baptizo* is used in the New Testament to signify immersion or overwhelming." Thus, in Luke 12: 50. "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straightened till it be accomplished," referring evidently to the sufferings he was to endure. Dr. Campbell has justly rendered the passage, "I have an *immersion* to undergo." Dr. Doddridge paraphrases it, "I know I shall shortly be plunged in

the most overwhelming distress. Prof. Stuart, "I am about to be *overwhelmed* with sufferings, and I am greatly distressed with the prospect of them." Similar examples are found in Mark 10 : 38, 39 ; Matt. 3 : 11, &c. We see our Savior "sunk in deep waters of affliction," overwhelmed with sufferings by "the waves and billows of anguish rolling over him." This evidently refers to the radical meaning of the word ; "any idea, short of a *complete immersion*, is tame and insipid."

The word is figuratively used to signify a burial.—Rom. 6 : 3, 4—"Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death ? Therefore WE ARE BURIED WITH HIM BY BAPTISM into death ; that, like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." In Col. 2 : 12, the same figure occurs : "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." "It seems too plain for argument, that baptism is here compared to a burial, in which, the believer, being 'dead to sin,' (Rom. 6 : 2,) is 'buried' in baptism, and from this emblematic grave, he rises again to a new and spiritual life. The figure is apt, *beautiful*, and *impressive*, if baptism is immersion ; but it has no apparent pertinency, if any thing else is baptism."—The important bearing of this passage will be seen, as "it is conceded by eminent Pedobaptists themselves, that 'the mass of unprejudiced readers,' would perceive in it 'an allusion to the practice of baptizing by immersion.'" These two parallel texts contain "God's own explanation of his own ordinance. And here we may admire the divine wisdom and goodness." The "translators of the Bible, by *adopting*, not translating the Greek words *baptize* and *baptism*, have hidden the meaning from the multitude. But the evidences from these passages *cannot be hid*—it is obvious to the most unlearned, and the words, 'BURIED WITH CHRIST BY BAPTISM' may continue to make, as a Pedobaptist writer says they have heretofore made, more Baptists than any other passage in the Bible. The Spirit of God, through this commentary of the great Apostle, enables all men to judge for themselves in this matter."

"The expressions, *baptized into Jesus Christ*, and *baptized into his death*, require explanation. The first, *baptized into Jesus Christ*, means to be baptized *into an acknowledgment of Jesus Christ*, with an implication of subjection, or discipleship, to him. So to be *baptized into the death of Christ*, is to be *baptized into an acknowledgment of his death*, and *into an acknowledgment of the obligations resulting from that death.*"

"It is contended, that the burying mentioned by the apostle, is not an external one, but an internal, a moral burying. This opinion seems effectually opposed by the circumstances, that the burying is performed *by baptism*, an external rite. * * If the apostle had merely said, we are dead and buried in respect to sin, *omitting the words, by baptism*, his language would require a different interpretation. But the apostle himself explains what he means *by burying*, when he adds *by baptism*.*

So Prof. Chase, "*Buried with him by baptism, buried with him—how? By baptism, the apostle answers. In or by baptism, then, Paul and the Christians whom he addresses were buried. To be crucified to the world, or dead to sin, is the character of the christian: but to be buried with Christ by baptism, is the appointed emblematical profession of that character. The apostle does not teach, that believers are crucified with Christ, or are dead with him, or possess a mortified temper, by baptism. To have such a state of soul, to be dead in respect to sin, is one thing; and to be buried with Christ by baptism, is quite a different thing; for this is external, whereas the other is internal. The one is a sign; the other, the thing signified.*"

To sustain the interpretation given above, the testimonies of several distinguished Pedobaptist writers may be adduced.

Rosenmüller, on the passage. "Immersion in the water of baptism, and coming forth out of it, was a symbol of a person's renouncing his former life, and, on the contrary, beginning a new one. The learned have rightly reminded us, that on account of this emblematical meaning of baptism, the RITE OF IMMERSION OUGHT TO HAVE BEEN RETAINED IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH."

Martin Luther after speaking of baptism as a symbol of death and resurrection, says: "On this account, I could wish, that such as are to be baptized, SHOULD BE COMPLETELY IMMERSSED INTO WATER, according to the meaning of the word, and the signification of the ordinance; AS ALSO WITHOUT DOUBT IT WAS INSTITUTED BY CHRIST."

Dr. Kuapp, an eminent and pious German divine, whose works are recommended by Dr. Woods, speaking of the passage in question, thus expresses the apostle's idea: "WE ARE LIKE CHRIST BURIED AS DEAD PERSONS, BY BAPTISM, and should arise, like him, to a new life." He adds, "The image is taken here from baptized persons, as they were IMMERSSED (buried), and as they EMERGED (rose again).

Dr. Bloomfield, "one of the most profound living biblical scholars of Great Britain, and highly commended by Prof. Stuart as a learned and judicious critic, gives this paraphrase of the words, "buried with him by baptism:" "WE HAVE BEEN THUS BURIED IN THE WATERS OF BAPTISM." He adds, "THERE IS A PLAIN ALLUSION TO THE ANCIENT CUSTOM OF BAPTISM BY IMMERSION."

Prof. Lange. "As Christ died, so we die (to sin) with him in baptism. The body is, as it were, buried under water, is dead with Christ; the plunging under water represents death, and rising out of it the resurrection to a new life. A more striking symbol could not be chosen."

The Author of the Free Inquiry on baptism. "This baptism of John and that of the apostles were performed in precisely the same way," i. e. THE CANDIDATE WAS COMPLETELY IMMERSSED UNDER WATER. Speaking of Rom. 6: 4, and Gal. 3: 27, he says; "What becomes of all these beautiful images, when, as at the present day, baptism is administered by pouring or sprinkling?"

Bloomfield in his Critical Digest on the passage, says; "There is here plainly a reference to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion; and I AGREE WITH KOOPFER AND ROSENMUELLER THAT THERE IS REASON TO REGRET IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN ABANDONED IN

* Ripley's Examination of Stuart.

most Christian churches, especially as it has so evidently a reference to the mystic sense of baptism."

Dr. Doddridge (in whose words we have Mr. John Wesley and Mr. George Whitfield, the former in a NOTE, and the latter in a sermon, on this verse) "Buried with him in baptism." "It seems the part of candor to confess, that here is an allusion to the manner of baptizing by immersion."

Dr. Wall (the learned author of that famous work, "the History of Infant Baptism," for which he received the thanks of the whole clergy in convocation,) after referring to several passages of scripture which he deemed "undeniable proofs, that the baptized person went ordinarily into the water, and sometimes the Baptist too, says: We should not know from these accounts whether the whole body of the baptized was put under water, head and all, were it not for two later proofs, which seem to me to PUT IT OUT OF QUESTION. ONE, That St. Paul does twice, in an allusive way of speaking, call baptism a BURIAL. THE OTHER, "The custom of the christians in the near succeeding times, which being more largely and particularly delivered in books, is known to have been generally, or ordinarily, a TOTAL IMMERSION."

Similar testimonies to these are given by Archbishop Tillotson, Archbishop Secker, Dr. Sam. Clarke, Dr. Wells, Assembly of Divines, Dr. Macknight, Dr. Towers, Neander, Tholuck, and a multitude of others.

As Dr. Wall has alluded to the practice of the primitive christians, we will just give the testimony of a few of the Fathers, who evidently refer to this passage, and more may be found under the 4th head, i. e. the practice of the ancient church.

Justin Martyr says: "We represent our Lord's sufferings and resurrection by baptism IN A POOL."

Clement of Alexandria, "You were led to a bath, as Christ was conveyed to the sepulchre, and were thrice immersed, to signify Christ's three day's burial."

Theodoret, on this passage, "Baptism is a type of our Lord's death;" and in Heb. 6: 2, "In holy baptism we receive the type of the resurrection."

Theophylact says: "Baptism typifies by immersion the death, by emersion the resurrection of Christ."

John Damascene; "Baptism represents the (deloi) death of our Lord."—"it is a type (τυπος) of his death;"—"the first baptism was the flood!"—"the old man was entirely buried in water."

Council of Toledo, "The immersion in water (in aquis mersio) is, as it were, the descent to Hades, and the emersion from the water, the resurrection."

Photius, quoted by Oecumenicus or Rom. 6: 4, and Athanasius, give the same explanation. So also the bishops, Gelasius, Gregory and Pelagius, in their rituals." These examples might be multiplied to a great extent.

"We cannot forbear noticing here a novel interpretation of Rom. 6: 4, (buried with him in baptism,) which is beginning to gain currency among certain American writers. It is gravely argued, that Paul, in that passage, had no allusion to the mode of baptism. See Stuart on the passage, and those who have copied from him. This is a discovery. The quotations from the early Fathers, and from the later German critics"—*preceding*, as well those *succeeding*, "will show, that none of them were ever blessed with this extraordinary illumination. It were easy to prove, that the biblical scholars of all nations, during the whole period intervening between the Christian Fathers and the modern German school, have all of them groped their way in equal darkness. Here, then, we have the remarkable fact, that while two, or three American controversialists,—in itself a suspicious circumstance,—invent a new inter-

pretation for a passage, that overthrows all their far-fetched arguments in favor of aspersion in baptism, the whole host of learned critics, from Justin Martyr down to Winer, Neander, Olshausen and Tholuck, stand arrayed against them in an unbroken phalanx. Will it be believed, that this portion of a book, written for the common people (who, by the way, have never failed of apprehending the true sense of this passage,) has been subjected to all classes of men in different ages of the world, in different nations, and in all cultivated languages for eighteen centuries, and that no man was ever found to open the seal and dissect a figure, until our enlightened opponents succeeded? We must not omit, in this connection, to mention a circumstance, which sets the views of the early church, in regard to the point now under discussion, in a clear light. We allude to the fact, that the great body of the ancient church reserved, except in cases of peril, all the baptisms of the year, until the festival of the death and resurrection of Christ. If there were other times of baptism, they were regarded as less solemn and appropriate, than the time of the Passover or Easter. Now the whole ground of this universal practice was that Paul, in their view, declared baptism to be an emblem of death and the resurrection. Here the act speaks louder than words. Though there is no controversy among those who profess to be acquainted with the subject, it may not be amiss to adduce a few passages by way of proof.*

Tertullian, De Bap. 19, says: "This is THE more appropriate DAY, as being the day of our Lord's sufferings, into which we are baptized." This sentiment prevailed to such an extreme, that Gregory, Nazianzen, Basil and Chrysostom, were obliged, as wise men, to labor to show, that any other time, though less interesting, was nevertheless perfectly proper for baptism. Those of whom Gregory speaks in his 40th Orat., preferred in baptism "to rise with Christ ON THE RESURRECTION DAY." Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, 27, says; The whole period of fifty days (from the Passover or Easter, to Pentecost) is a memorial of our resurrection." Thus, even when the day of Pentecost was fixed upon for baptism, as it some times was, though less frequently, it was at the same time a reminiscence of the two scenes of the resurrection of Christ, and of the effusion of the Holy Spirit. Chrysostom, 1 Hom. on Acts, while he admits, that the 'grace itself' of baptism is the same on Pentecost, gives the preference to Easter or the passover, because the mind is then impressed with "LOFTER ENHIMENTS." Socrates, 5, 22, speaks of those who baptize only on the day of the Passover. Siricius, bishop of Rome, says: "this ordinance is observed WITH ALL THE CHURCHES at the Paschal festival and Pentecost." Leo the Great censures certain individuals 'for the irrational innovation of baptizing AT ANY OTHER TIME THAN that of the Passover.' The council of Auxerrein, 578, prohibited baptism 'AT ANY OTHER TIME than Easter.' The council of Matiscon did the same in 583. J. A. Schmid, in his Hist. Fest., p. 121, says; 'In the Latin church, the ninth hour, i. e. 3 o'clock P. M., this festival was designated for baptism, because it was at that hour that Christ died, whose death was imitated in baptism." Augusti, 2, 7, says; 'From the earliest times, this day was selected for baptism, as special importance was attached to baptism into the death of Christ.'

We have adduced these testimonies, from history, because we deem them decisive, not a note of remonstrance in all the

* The Christian Review, edited by Prof. Sears, of Newton, Mass., published by Gould, Kendal, and Lincoln, Boston.

Fathers, have we ever seen against them. That the ancient fathers understood the *design of baptism* to be a *symbolical representation of the death, burial, and resurrection* of Christ, we think must be manifest from their testimonies. Whenever they speak of *baptism*, they, almost always point to the *death, burial and resurrection of Christ*.

III. THE PLACES SELECTED FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ORDINANCE, AND THE CIRCUMSTANCES CONNECTED WITH ITS PERFORMANCE, WHERE THEY ARE DESCRIBED, FURNISHES ANOTHER ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF IMMERSION.

“John the Baptist did baptize in the wilderness, * * * and there went out unto him all the land of Judea, * * * and were all baptized of him *in the river Jordan*.”* Here it is explicitly stated, that those who were baptized of him, were baptized in the river Jordan. If the idea advanced by *some*, that the preposition (en) *in* may mean *at*, yet why should he resort to a river at all “excepting that immersion was practised.”† “But Prof. Robinson a Pedobaptist, and the learned author of the *Lexicon of the New Testament*, translates the Greek particle (en) *in* or *into*, in all the instances in which John’s baptism is spoken of. Jesus was baptized by John *in (eis) Jordan*; or, as Prof. Robinson translates, “*INTO the river Jordan*.”‡

Dr. Campbell in his notes on Mathew 3: 11, makes the following statement: “In water—in the Holy Spirit, (en udati—en agio pneumati.) English translation, with water—with the Holy Ghost. Vulgate, [that is Latin translation,] in aqua—in Spiritu Sancto. Thus, also, the Syrac and other ancient versions. I am sorry to observe that the Popish translators from the vulgate, have shown greater veneration for the style of that version, than the generality of the Protestant translators have shown for that of the original. For in this, the Latin is not more explicit than the Greek. Yet so inconsistent are the interpreters last mentioned, that, none of them have scrupled to render (en to Jordane,) in the sixth verse, in Jordan; though, nothing can be plainer, than that, if there be any incongruity in the expression in water; this, in Jordan, must be equally incongruous.” But they have seen that the preposition, *IN*, could not be avoided “without adopting a circumlocution, and saying, with the water of Jordan, which would have made their deviation from the text too glaring.”

Mr. Hervy, when contending that *en*, signifies in; adds, I can prove it to have been in peaceable possession of this signification two thousand years. “Every one knows,” he observes in another place, “that with, is not the native, obvious, and literal meaning; but rather a meaning swayed, influenced, moulded by the preceding or following word.”—Letters to Mr. Wesley.

“In four of the first versions of the Bible into English, we find these words rendered literally ‘in water;’ but the expression not suiting the prevailing custom, it was afterward

* Dr. Shaw says, “before it enters the Dead Sea, its ordinary breadth is about thirty yards, but it is exceedingly deep, even to the brink of its inner bank.” It was so deep that a miracle was performed to make a passage for Israel, (Josh. iii: 9, 17,) and for Elijah, (2 Kings vi: 5). It was in this deep river, that a young man lost his axe, (2 Kings vi: 1, 5). In this river Naaman dipped (baptized) himself seven times (2 Kings v: 14.). Reader, surely this was deep enough for baptizing.

† Prof. Stuart.

‡ Vide Lex. on the word Baptizo, 2 (a). See Bloomfield, note upon the passage.

rendered 'with water.' It is in,—in the Vulgate, Syriac, Arabic and Ethiopic, and several more modern versions.

Tyndal, one of the first four translators, says: "I baptize you in water, in token of repentance."

"And John was also baptizing in Enon, near Salim, *because there was much water there*: and they came and were baptized." (John 3; 23.) Now the reason is expressly stated, why he so selected this place, because the *much water* afforded facility for the performance of the rite. This passage is plain and obvious, and, though it might be susceptible of the translation, Beza and others contend for, i. e. (*many streams or rivulets.*) Still it would afford conveniences for immersion. The Holy Spirit does not say John made choice of this spot, to accommodate the people with water to use,—nor their beasts to drink,—but on account of its convenience for baptizing. But Prof. Ripley has shown, with a clearness, force and precision which ought ever to settle the question, that our translation is correct, and not to be discarded.* "See Jer. 41: 12, compared 2 Samuel 2: 12, 13, 14. On which read Robinson's Calmet, under the word GIBEON. Also consult Rev. 1: 5, 19: 6, where the same words are used to designate *the ocean.*"

The case of the Ethiopian Eunuch next claims our attention. "As they went on their way, they came unto certain water, * * and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the spirit of the Lord caught away Philip." (Acts 8: 36—39.) Now for what purpose did Philip and the Eunuch *go down both into the water*, if it were not that he might *immerse* him. Now the impression, which would naturally rest upon the mind, of a plain man, when reading this account, must evidently be the true one. But it is sometimes said that the preposition (eis) here is often rendered to. But what did they go down to the water for if not for immersion. Hear

Dr. Doddridge.—"It would be very unnatural to suppose, that they went down to the water, merely that Philip might take up a little water in his hand to pour on the Eunuch. A person of his dignity had, no doubt, many vessels in his baggage, [by which water might be brought into his chariot,] on such a journey, through a desert country; a precaution absolutely necessary for travelling in those parts, and never omitted by them."—See Dr. Shaw's Travels.

The criticism on the Greek preposition, in this place, is far from just † "The verb here translated *went down*, when followed by the preposition used in this passage, includes almost uni-

* So Olshansen, De Wette, Kuinæ, Grotius, Bloomfield, Doddridge, and others.

† Consult Prof. Ripley's examination of Stuart, Boston, 1833. Also, Robinson's Lexicon, Katabainon, (a) Anabainon (a). Likewise Doddridge, on the passage.

formly, in the New Testament, the idea of entrance *into* the place mentioned, e. g. "Jesus went down to Capernaum." Again it is said, "Jacob went down to Egypt." Is it not clearly implied here, that Jesus went *into* Capernaum? Jacob, *into* Egypt and not merely to the borders of it? So in common parlance, "we say of a man, he has gone to New York,—meaning he has gone into the city to buy goods."

IV. THE PRACTICE OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS, AND OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD FOR MANY CENTURIES, SHOWS *that* THEY *understood* BAPTISM *to mean* IMMERSION.

It may not be wholly inapposite to state here, that the argument from church history, is not the one on which we place our *chief dependence*. We claim to belong to a denomination that regards the BIBLE as our ONLY and SUFFICIENT *rule of faith and practice*: and to our mind, the Bible is perfectly clear on this subject. We have also a satisfactory comment, of what our Savior taught on this subject, in the practice of the early Christians, who, in all probability, regulated their practice by his instructions, and the apostle's example.

The question naturally arises here, how did the early Christians understand the word and represent it in their practices? Now, "he that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

Barnabas, the companion of Paul, (Acts 13: 2,) says, in his Epistle, speaking of baptism, "WE DESCEND INTO THE WATER, AND COME OUT OF IT."

In the Pastor of Hermas, saluted by Paul, (Rom. 16: 14,) it is stated: "Men descended into the water, bound to death; but ascended out of it, sealed to life."

Justin Martyr, in giving the pagans a general account of Christian doctrines, and practices, says: "Those who BELIEVE, are led to some place where there is water, and there bathe in the water." In another place, he says: "We represent our Lord's sufferings and resurrection, BY BAPTISM IN A POOL."

"There can be no doubt what is meant by bathing in a pool, or swimming-place, in such a manner as to represent the death and resurrection of Christ. This is not the description of any one case of baptism, but a UNIVERSAL DESCRIPTION."

Tertullian.—"WE ARE IMMersed IN WATER,"—"LET DOWN INTO THE WATER AND DIPPED." "PETER IMMersed IN THE TIBER" "It is one thing to be SPRINKLED, (aspergi,) by the violence of the waves in a boat, and another to be DIPPED, (tingui,) in a religious ordinance. It is indifferent whether one is baptized in the sea or in a pool, in a river or a fountain, in a lake or the bed of a river."

Apostolical Constitutions.—"Baptism relates to the death of Christ: THE WATER ANSWERS TO THE GRAVE; the IMMERSION represents our dying with him: the EMERSION, our rising with him."

Cyril of Jerusalem.—"He who is immersed in water and baptized, is surrounded with water on all sides."

Basil the Great.—"THE BODIES of those that are baptized, are, as it were, BURIED IN WATER."

Gryostom.—"We, as in a sepulchre, "IMMERSING our heads in water, the old man is" buried, and SINKING down, the whole is concealed at once." "He speaks of baptism in innumerable instances in 13 folio volumes, but never alludes to sprinkling."

Leo, bishop of Rome.—"True immersion represents the three day's burial of Christ."

Jerome.—"Three times we are immersed," &c.

Augustine.—"Rightly are ye IMMersed three times, who have received baptism in the name of Christ."

These are but a few of the multitude of testimonies that might be quoted, had we space,

“To these passages from the Christian Fathers, we subjoin the testimony of some of the modern German critics. We bespeak particular attention to these, not only, on account of their impartiality, as they have no interest in the controversy, but, on account of their being the very highest authority in language and antiquities.”

Tholuck, on Romans 6: 4.—“In order to understand the figurative use of baptism, we must bear in mind THE WELL KNOWN FACT, that the candidate, in the primitive church, WAS IMMERSSED IN WATER, AND RAISED OUT OF IT AGAIN.” In his Manuscript Lecture on Col. 2: 12, he says: “The candidate was immerssed, and not sprinkled, as with us.”

Winer.—“In the apostolical age, BAPTISM WAS BY IMMERSION, as its symbolical explanation shows.”

Bretschneider.—“The apostolical church baptized only by immersion.”

“Schleusner, Wahl, and Bretschneider, the three great New Testament lexicographers of Germany, LIMIT baptism, as a sacred ordinance to IMMERSION.”

Hahn.—“ACCORDING TO APOSTOLICAL INSTRUCTION AND EXAMPLE, baptism was performed BY IMMERSING THE WHOLE MAN.”

Prof. Lange.—“Baptism in the apostolical age, was a proper baptism, THE IMMERSION OF THE WHOLE BODY IN WATER. PLUNGING UNDER WATER represents death, and RISING OUT OF IT, the resurrection to a new life.”

Fritsch.—“With infant baptism, still ANOTHER change in the outward form of baptism was introduced, that of SPRINKLING WITH WATER, instead of THE FORMER PRACTICE OF IMMERSION.”

With these agree the testimonies of Olshanson, Pengel, Usteri, Rheinwolds; Schloz, and Starck.

I will here add the testimonies of some of the best historians.

Neander, says: “Baptism was ORIGINALLY BY IMMERSION; to this form various comparisons of the apostle Paul allude.”

Guericke.—“Baptism was ORIGINALLY administered by IMMERSION.”—Waddington calls “immersion, THE OLDEST FORM OF BAPTISM.” Mosheim, Dupin, Milner, Gregory, Venema, and indeed all the best historians affirm that the practice of the primitive churches was immersion.

“After these testimonies, you will be prepared to appreciate the concession of Prof. Stuart, who, quoting Augusti, says: “It is a thing made out,” viz: the ancient practice of immersion. “I know,” continues the Prof., “of no one usage which seems to be more clearly, and certainly made out. I cannot see how it is possible for any candid man who examines this subject, to deny this.” He finally comes to this conclusion, “that from the earliest ages of which we have any account, subsequent to the apostolic age, and downward for several centuries, the churches generally practised baptism by immersion, perhaps *by immersion of the whole person*; and, that the only exceptions to this mode which were usually allowed, were in cases of immediate and imminent danger, where immersion could not be practised.”

It is a fact, notorious in history, that the whole Christian church for the space of 1300 years, practised immersion, except in cases of sickness. This can be established by the testimonies of Pedobaptists. Hear the testimony of Dr. Whitby, in his exposition of Romans.

Dr. Whitby, (author of a Commentary, and more than forty other learned works,) says : " It being so expressly declared here, and Colos. 2: 12, that we are BURIED WITH CHRIST IN BAPTISM, by being buried under water, and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death, by dying to sin, being taken hence; and THIS IMMERSION BEING RELIGIOUSLY OBSERVED BY ALL CHRISTIANS FOR THIRTEEN CENTURIES, and approved by our church, and the change of it into sprinkling, even without any allowance from the author of this institution, or any license from any council of the church, being that which the Romanist still urgeth to justify the refusal of the cup to the laity; it were to be wished that this custom might be again of general use, and aspersion only permitted, as of old, in cases of CLINICI, or in present danger of death."

Bossuet.—" We are able to make it appear, by acts of councils, and by the ancient rituals, that, for THIRTEEN HUNDRED YEARS, baptism was thus [by immersion] administered throughout the whole church, as far as possible."

Stackhouse.—" Several authors have shown that we read no where in Scripture of any one's being baptized, but by immersion, and from the acts of councils and ancient rituals have proved, that this immersion continued (as much as possible) to be used for THIRTEEN HUNDRED YEARS after Christ."

Brenner, a Roman Catholic writer, states, " that THIRTEEN HUNDRED YEARS was baptism generally and ordinarily performed by the immersion of a man under water, and only on extraordinary occasions was sprinkling or affusion permitted. These latter methods are called in question, and even prohibited.—Stuart, p. 361.

Encyclopedia Americana, speaking of Baptism, says: " that it is DIPPING, immersing from the Greek baptizo."

Again, " In the time of the apostles, the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or vessel, with the words which Christ had ordered, and, to express more fully his change of character, generally adopted a new name. The immersion of the whole body was omitted only in the case of the sick, who could not leave their beds. In this case sprinkling was substituted, which was called CLINIC BAPTISM. The Greek church as well as the schismatics in the East retained the custom of immersing the whole body; but the Western church adopted in the 13th century the mode of baptism by sprinkling which has been continued by the Protestants, the Baptists (q. v.) only excepted."

Edinburgh Encyclopedia, edited by Sir David Brewster, allowed to be one of the best scholars of the age, states: " that the word BAPTIZO means to immerse, or Paul would never have said that we are BURIED with Christ by baptism and that immersion was practised by all christians until the beginning of the fourteenth century. That the Council of Ravenna, held in 1311 first sanctioned sprinkling; but corrupt as was the church of Rome, whose council this was, it did not ENJOIN sprinkling, but merely said that it was admissible."

Encyclopedia Ecclesiastica.—(This splendid work published, A. D. 1835, under the patronage of the highest authorities in the British nation, both in church and state, after stating the reasons now urged in defence of sprinkling, proceeds,) " Whatever weight, however, may be in these reasons as a defence for the present practice of sprinkling, it is EVIDENT that, during the first ages of the church, and for MANY CENTURIES afterwards, the practice of immersion prevailed; and which seems indeed NEVER to be departed from, except where it was administered to a person at the point of death, or upon a bed of sickness,—which was considered indeed as not giving the party the full privileges of baptism,—or when there was not a sufficient supply of water. Except in the above cases, the custom was to DIP or IMMERSE the whole body." Hence St. Barnabas, says: " We go down into the water," &c. &c.—Article BAPTISM.

Prof. Stuart, states on the authority of John Floyer,* " that the English church PRACTISED immersion down to the beginning of the SEVENTEENTH CENTURY; after which a change to the method of sprinkling took place. But though, sprinkling is now the universal practice with them, their liturgy has ALWAYS required immersion except in cases of weakness."

It is universally admitted, by all intelligent and candid Pedobaptists, that the Oriental Greek Church, which comprises a large portion of Christendom, have always practised the rite of immersion. Says Prof. Stuart, " The mode of baptism by immersion, the Oriental church has always continued to preserve, even down to the present time. The members of this church are accustomed to call the members of the western

* In a work of John Floyer on Cold Bathing, p. 50,

churches, *sprinkled christians*, by way of ridicule and contempt. They maintain that *baptizo* can mean nothing but *immerse*; and that *baptism by sprinkling* is as great a solecism as *immersion by sprinkling*; and they claim to themselves the honor of having preserved the ancient sacred rite of the church free from change and from corruption, which would destroy its significancy." The reader will here recollect that the New Testament was written in Greek, and that the Greeks themselves declare that *Baptizo* means to *immerse* and *nothing else*, and that to talk of 'baptism by sprinkling,' is as inconsistent as to talk of 'immersion by sprinkling.' This testimony is entitled to the greatest credit.* And however great a change the Greek language may have undergone with respect to the meaning of many words, we have seen by a reference to classic usage and the practice of the ancient church, that *baptizo* (which is still vernacular to the modern Greeks,) has undergone no change. This testimony of the Greeks appears to me decisive, and I do not see how any candid man can reject it.

Finally, it must be admitted, by the most learned of all denominations, that from the Apostolic age downwards, we have an unbroken chain of evidence showing that immersion, and immersion only, was practised by all christians for 1300 years; and in England for 1600. The only deviation, or exception to this practice, was in cases of *extreme sickness*, when pouring or affusion was practised as a substitute. This was done on the ground that *baptism was essential to salvation*; † and though it was not regarded as regular baptism, yet it was hoped that by the indulgence of God it would be accepted, and the soul of the person, who thus received baptism, would be saved.— This was resorted to only from the exigency of the case, immersion not being practicable; and it was never defended, in the early ages of the church, on the ground of tradition, or Apostolical example, or of a license from the Head of the Church.

It may be interesting, and perhaps edifying to some of our

* Mr. Robinson the historian, very wisely remarks: "The testimony of the Greeks, is an authority for the meaning of *BAPTIZO*, infinitely preferable to that of European lexicographers; so that a man who is obliged to trust human testimony, and who baptizes by immersion because the Greeks do, understands a Greek word exactly as the Greeks themselves understand it; and in this case the Greeks are unexceptional guides."

† The first case of Clinic Baptism that Dr. Wall could discover, was the case of Novatian, about A. D. 250. Eusebius records: that this man while unbaptized, fell into a dangerous disease, and because he was very like to die, was baptized in the bed where he lay, or water poured all over him, "if that might be termed baptism."

The validity of this baptism was afterwards called in question, and the church was divided on the subject. Sprinkling or affusion for baptism, has been the cause, from first to last, of many contentions and divisions in the church.

friends here, as well as yourself, to know how *rantism* (sprinkling) is supported in our country. As a specimen, in addition to those made by Dr. Dwight and Barnes, we cite the following unfounded assertions, a part of which are taken from Dr. Miller's work on Baptism, and the residue are a specimen of what are contained in a tract, entitled "The Scripture Directory to Baptism," "by a Layman:"

"Thus far, says he, "we have pursued our inquiry: and after a careful perusal and examination of every part of the scriptures which had any kind of bearing upon this subject, we have never been able to find any precept, warrant, example, or practice, of Christ or his Apostles, which look any thing like dipping. And from all the books we have ever read upon the subject, on any side, we have never seen a quotation from any of the fathers or writers of *ANY AGE*, that there was ever any such thing thought of, hinted at, or written about, as *IMMERSION*, in any place, or any church, until about the beginning of the twelfth century; when a few individuals began to think some new mode better than the old." And again: "They [the Baptists] never have, and they never can find a *SINGLE CASE* in the New Testament, nor in all the writings of the Fathers, nor in any authentic history for nearly *ONE THOUSAND YEARS* after them, where it is stated positively, that any church in any place ever did dip or immerse a single person." For aught we know to the contrary, this Layman may be one of Dr. Miller's pupils; for the Doctor, in his work on Baptism, published in 1835, says: "There is not the smallest probability, that he [John] ever baptized an individual in this manner! (by immersion,)" p. 93. "The sacred writers have not stated a single fact, or employed a single term, which evinces that they either preferred or practised immersion in a *SINGLE CASE*," p. 99. "Immersion is not even the common meaning of the word" baptize; p. 84. "All impartial judges—by which I mean all of the most profound and mature Greek scholars, who are neither theologians or sectarians—agree in pronouncing, that the term in question imports the application of water by sprinkling," p. 85.

"This is the man," says the Christian Review, "that speaks *ex cathedra* in his book, from the beginning to the end, using such terms as '*I can assure you, my friends,*' and brands with ignorance and infamy, those who maintain the contrary."

My friend, will you please contrast these affirmations with the testimony of the Pedobaptist writers we have quoted, (among whom may be named such men as the Reformers, Martin Luther and John Calvin, and Doctors Wall, Whitby, Campbell, Knapp, McKnight, Bloomfield, Neander, and Professors Hahn, Porson, Lange, Tholuck, Olshausen, Stuart, &c., together with all the Greek lexicographers,) and then it is presumed, he will be enabled to judge on which side truth lies. It is to be regretted, that Dr. Miller and the "Layman" have not published the authorities on which they base their novel assertions respecting the meaning of the term *baptizo*, and the practice of the *ancient church*. Had they done this, they might have enlightened the most learned divines of the United States, Europe, and the world; and taught them what they never before learned, viz: that "immersion is not even the common meaning of the word" baptize, and "that there was [never] any such thing thought of, hinted at, or written about, as *immersion*, in any place or church, until about the beginning of the twelfth century, when a few individuals began to think that some *new*

mode was better than the old," etc. Let us now hear what Doctors Wall and Campbell say on this subject:

Dr. Wall (who explored all the voluminous writers of antiquity, in search of evidence of infant baptism) says: "This [immersion] is so plain and clear, by an INFINITE NUMBER of passages, that as one cannot but pity the weak endeavors of such Pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it, so we ought to disown and show a dislike of the PROFANE SCOFFS which some people give to the English Anti-Pedobaptists, merely for the use of dipping; when it was, in all probability, the way our SAVIOUR, and FOR CERTAIN, was the most usual way by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism. 'Tis a great want of PRUDENCE, as well as HONESTY, to refuse to grant to an adversary what is CERTAINLY TRUE, and may be PROVED so. It creates a jealousy of all the rest one says." "The custom of the Christians, in the near succeeding times [to the Apostles.] being more largely and particularly delivered in books, is known to have been generally or ordinarily a total immersion."

Dr. Campbell, in his Lectures on Systematic Theology and Pulpit Eloquence, says: "I have heard a disputant, in defiance of Etymology and use, maintain that the word rendered in the New Testament baptize, means more properly to sprinkle than to plunge; and, in defiance of all antiquity, that the former method was the earliest, and for many centuries the most general practice of baptizing. One who argues in this manner, never fails to betray the cause he would defend; and though, with respect to the vulgar, bold assertions generally succeed as well as arguments, sometimes better, yet a CANDID MIND will DISDAIN to take the help of a FALSEHOOD even in support of the truth."

The first change of immersion for sprinkling, by Protestants, is another evidence that the practice of the primitive church was immersion.

The Rev. Mr. Bliss, of New York, states, on the authority of Dr. Wall and others: "That John Calvin, the founder of the Presbyterian church, is the father of this exchange of a divine ordinance among Protestants. He first began it in 1556, at Geneva. The number of baptisms there became so much increased, that he first in that year invented the practice of *drenching* the candidate by pouring a pail of water on him, as being more convenient than immersion, afterwards of pouring a less quantity, and finally of mere sprinkling." Dr. Wall, in describing the fact, says that pouring was the substitute for baptism, which Calvin first adopted, and that his sprinkling was only the *substitute* of a *substitute*, and was the most scandalous thing ever adopted for baptism. The sprinkling of our country, then, the Episcopal Wall being witness, is only the *substitute* of a *substitute*; quite another thing from the divine ordinance itself. Again, Dr. Wall says: "the Presbyterian church in Geneva, is the first church on earth that ever enjoined sprinkling."* This was about the year 1556. During the persecutions of Queen Mary and the bloody Bishop Bonner,

* "Calvin invented and continued the Presbyterian form of government, empowering the few to govern the many. This Presbyterian body soon passed a law, at Geneva, enforcing sprinkling as baptism. Calvin alludes to this usurpation of power, by this denomination, when he says: 'The church (i. e. Presbyterianism) hath granted to herself the privilege of somewhat altering the form of baptism, retaining the substance;' i. e. the words." Here we see the ground on which sprinkling was first maintained by Protestants.

many persons from England, most of whom were Scotsmen, fled to the Continent, and visited Geneva, and there greedily imbibed the opinions of that church. On the death of Queen Mary in 1558, and the accession of Elizabeth, they in 1559 returned to Scotland with John Knox at their head, and reported "how the famous godly man John Calvin, as he was called, had improved on baptism." This was the commencement of the introduction of the substitute, sprinkling, into Scotland, according to the new Edinburgh Encyclopedia, and from thence into England, in 1559. This Encyclopedia "intimates that a popish council at Ravenna in 1311, had said that sprinkling or pouring, would do among Papists, but yet scarce any adopted it." The very learned Dr. Gale, in 1707, writes, (*Reflections on Wall*, p. 153,) "Baptism which *all men* know was used to be administered in England by dipping or immersion, till Queen Elizabeth's time; since which time, that pure, *primitive* manner is grown into total disuse within little more than one hundred years; and *sprinkling*, the most opposite to it imaginable, introduced in its stead. The fact is notorious," &c. Grotious asserts also, that "the ordinance has been changed from immersion to sprinkling." The learned Dionysius Petavius, refers to the same alteration. We would introduce the testimony of others had we space.

"It was not till near the year 1640, that a parliamentary act was finally passed, requiring all the children in the realm, and all the people, to be sprinkled, under the penalty of being treated as outlaws," etc. From 1534, the beginning of the Episcopal organization, *immersion* was required by law till 1640. "When the Presbyterian confession of faith was adopted at Westminster, in 1643, it was put to vote in that assembly, whether immersion should be retained, or sprinkling substituted in its place. Twenty-four voted for immersion, and twenty-five for sprinkling. This small majority was gained by the great personal popularity of Dr. Lightfoot, who gave the casting vote in favor of sprinkling."*

* This account of the change of the rite of baptism, from immersion to sprinkling, is abridged and taken mainly from Rev. John F. Bliss' Fourth Letter, published in the *New York Baptist Register*. Mr. Bliss, who is a graduate (if my memory serves,) of William's College, has been for more than twenty years a congregational minister, and during that time has been instrumental in planting more than twenty Congregational churches in western New York. He was baptized last January, and is now settled over the Baptist Church, in Henrietta, New York. After having studied, to use his own language, "twenty-five years after principles of christian union; and amidst all the fog that is afloat, after the real organization of Christ's kingdom;" and after having thoroughly investigated the subject of baptism, (as his able letters abundantly show,) he was at length compelled, like many others, by evidence and TRUTH, to renounce Pedobaptism and become a Baptist.

“It is notorious, that in all the countries where the power of the Pope of Rome was never admitted, and among all denominations of christians, who do not acknowledge their descent either directly or remotely from Popery, immersion is now, and always has been practised: and Dr. Wall says, if we take the division of the world from the three main parts of it, all the christians in Asia, all in Africa, and about one-third part of Europe, are of the last sort, (i. e. in which third part are comprehended the christians of Græcia, Thracia, Servia, Bulgaria, Roscio, Wallachia, Moldavia, Russia, Nigra, and so on; and even the Muscovites, who, if coldness of country will excuse, might plead for a dispensation with the most reason of any.”

I have now given you some of the main evidences we have for believing that immersion only is baptism. *First*, the signification of the word;—*Second*, its figurative use;—*Third*, the places selected *for*, and the circumstances connected *with*, the administration of the rite;—*Fourth*, the practice of the early christians, and the christian world for many centuries.—I fear I have trespassed somewhat upon your time and patience, as I have been more extensive in my remarks and testimonies, than I at first intended.

Pedobaptist.—Although you have occupied some time, yet I have listened with much interest to the arguments advanced, to sustain your position, that immersion only is baptism; and I must say, that I deem them weighty. Indeed, the testimonies and evidences you have produced, show, very conclusively, that the primary, radical meaning of baptizo, is immerse; and that the Greek church, for aught we know to the contrary, have always practised it; and that immersion was the practice of the whole church, except in cases of sickness for 12 or 13 centuries. Indeed, I do not see how any man can doubt this, still there are “certain places in the scriptures in which some form of the word baptize occurs, and others where the ordinance is mentioned, which render it *very improbable*, that an immersion was either positively enjoined or invariably practised.”

Baptist.—My dear friend, we have a remark to make here, which we deem of importance for you to remember: that is, that the evidence which we have adduced, proves, conclusively, that the word under consideration, (*Pedobaptist's* themselves being judges,) *must mean immersion*. Hence, it follows, that “*we are not permitted to assign to it any other meaning, unless in a given case immersion be impossible.*” “Where a thing is proved by sufficient evidence, no objections from difficulties can be admitted as decisive, unless they involve an impossibility.” Those then, who would assign to the word in question the meaning either of *washing*, *pouring*, or *sprinkling*, are bound to prove, not only that the idea of immersion is improbable, but that is manifestly **IMPOSSIBLE**. This, I believe, cannot be done, in a single instance; however, with these remarks, if you

will please give us the passages in which it is improbable that immersion was practised, we will examine them.

Pedobaptist.—The canon you have laid down, by which we should be governed in settling the true meaning of a word, I must say, appears consistent. But, as I am quite solicitous to hear your comments upon these passages, I will first cite: Mark 7: 3, 4. “For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash (*nipsontai*,) their hands oft, eat not holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they wash (*baptizontia*,) they eat not.” Does not the word *Baptizontia*, here, mean wash?

Baptist.—If this washing is included in the idea of immersion it is presumed that it does. Take for illustration the case of Naaman (2 Kings 5: 14). The man of God commanded him to go wash or bathe (*lousai*) himself seven times in the river Jordan, and he went down and dipped (*ebaptisato*) himself, etc.* Here the word *baptizo* is translated *dipping* and washing is evidently included in, or is the consequence of that dipping.

Now all that I am bound to prove here, is that it is *possible*, for the word *baptizontia* from *baptizo*, to mean immerse. “Here” says Prof. Ripley, “are two instances of washing (so called); the first, a matter of constant occurrence; the second, an observance performed after returning from market. * * * If, ordinarily, the hands were washed before eating, without regard to the employment which had preceded, the reader is prepared to hear that after returning from a mixed crowd of people, where he was exposed to various occasions of defilement, something different from, or additional to, this washing, (to wit,) a more formal and thorough ablution would naturally be performed.”

“In the second place, two different Greek words are employed to express the washing in the two different cases. The former is the word usually employed when only washing a part of the body, as the hands, face, or feet, is performed; the latter is used to denote the washing of the whole body by immersion.†

* As it regards *baptizo* being translated to wash in this and two or three other places in the New Testament. I would introduce by way of explanation the language of an Episcopalian clergyman, in a letter to Bishop Hoadly. “The writers of the New Testament make use of two words, *BAPTIZO* and *LOUO*, which leads us to the precise meaning of baptism, the latter of which is almost the constant word of the Septuagint, in those very numerous places where bathing or washing the whole body is commanded, in contradiction to every other practice of washing the hands or feet, or sprinkling or washing of clothes. *Lousetai udati*, occurs no less than eleven times in one chapter, where bathing the body is appointed on sundry occasions, as a distinct rite from washing the hands or garments, &c. &c. Since therefore, *LOUSETAI UDATI* used times without number in the Old Testament, never imports less than bathing or washing the whole body; it follows, that baptism means the same, when it is expressed ‘BY OUR BODIES WASHED IN PURE WATER.’”

† Robinson’s *Lex. Baptizo*; def. 2: remark, comp. *Nipto*.

The passage should be translated thus: "For the Pharisees and all the Jews except they *wash* their hands oft eat not; and when they come from the market, except they *bathe* themselves they eat not. This was the opinion of Vatabulus a distinguished Professor of Hebrew at Paris. He says, on this passage, 'they cleansed themselves more carefully from defilement contracted at the market, to wit: by not only washing their hands, but even by immersing their body.' For these numerous immersions, the Jews had the most convenient arrangements, and their mode of dress would render the practice less burdensome than it would be with us."

Grotius, on this passage says: "They were more solicitous to cleanse themselves from the defilement they had contracted in the market, and therefore, they not only WASHED their hands, but IMMERSED their WHOLE BODIES." With him agree Beza, Fritsch, and others.

Dr. Gill, on this passage, gives us a quotation from Maimonides, a Jewish writer, who it is presumed, knew something of the Oriental customs and practices of his countrymen. "Washed in a laver which holds forty seahs of water, which are not drawn, every defiled man dips himself, and in it they dip all unclean vessels, as cups, pots, &c."

Judson, in his sermon on baptism preached at Calcutta, in 1812, says: "It will not appear strange to you that the Jews, on returning from market, IMMERSED themselves; for you are acquainted with the custom of these eastern countries, and witness the frequent ceremonial immersions of the natives."

Olshausen, in his Commentary, says: "BAPTIZESTHAI is DIFFERENT FROM NIPTESTHAI; the former is, here the IMMERSION and RINSING of the food purchased at the market, to remove from it any impurity it may have contracted; the latter includes the idea of rubbing, as in every form of washing." "Kuinol and Meier agree with Olshausen, that it was the 'food brought from the market' that was said to be 'baptized.'" Others, as Lightfoot and Schottgen, show, from the Rabbinical writers, that there were two modes of washing the hands among the scrupulous Jews, and believe, that here (Mark 7: 4,) the IMMERSION OF THE HANDS is to be understood." It appears that in either of the above expositions, baptism was regarded as immersion instead of washing.

Pedobaptist.—My friend, your explanations and testimonies thus far, are as explicit and abundant as any one could ask for. But as I did not quote the latter clause of the 4th verse, I should like to hear you explain that. "The washing of cups and pots and brazen vessels and *tables*" (couches). Is it not altogether improbable, that the couches (for so the word rendered tables should be translated) on which they reclined at meals, should be immersed?

Baptist.—In reply to your question, I would remark, that the learned Prof. Robinson of Andover, gives his views of the mode of washing by quoting, Lev. 11: 32,—showing that he understands all those articles were "put into water." Things which had been defiled by the touch of a dead body were required by the Levitical law to be cleansed by "being put into water."

Judson, on this passage, says: "What is more probable than that they abused the first institution of this ceremony, by superstitiously immersing a variety of articles, not included in the divine command." And it is historically certain that they did this. Maimonides, the commentator, quoted above, states that it was a traditional custom of the Jews,

to immerse all vessels received of a Gentile or an Israelite designed for eating, drinking, and cooking, before using them. See his testimony as given by Gill on this passage, Again, he says: "Wherever in the law, washing of the flesh, or of the clothes are mentioned, it means nothing else than the dipping the whole body in a laver." He also states that, "a bed that is wholly defiled, if a man dips it part by part, it is pure. A pillow or bolster of skin, he must dip them, and lift them up by the fringes." "Scaliger and Misenh, agree in this, that the Jewish washings of the body, clothes, cups, tables, brazen vessels, beds, &c. was always by immersion in water." Their tables, it should be remembered were not like ours, but couches or beds on which they generally slept, or mattresses on which they reclined at their meals.

These facts establish all that is desirable in the case, as they show that it is not only practicable for these vessels to be cleansed by immersion, but that it was in all probability done. In some of the cases it was plainly commanded, and "we are compelled by reason and the laws of language," to give to the word its true meaning. And even the shadow of a reason cannot consistently be urged why the baptism of these cups, etc., should not be translated *immersion of cups*, etc.

Pedobaptist.—There is another passage I should like to have you explain, it is in Luke 11 : 37, 38. "And as he was speaking, a certain Pharisee besought him to dine with him, and he went in and set down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed (ebaptisthe,) before dinner."

Baptist.—After what has been said of the passage in Mark, the same practice to which this evidently refers, it would seem that no further remarks are necessary. It appears by what preceded this account, that our Savior had been exposed to a mixed crowd, "and the superstitious Pharisee was surprised that he should sit down to meat without first purifying himself by bathing or washing his whole person according to the custom." Bruce, the celebrated traveller, informs us that in Abyssinia, the sect called Kenimont, "wash themselves *from head to foot* after coming from the market, or any public place, where they may have touched any one of a different sect from their own, deeming all such unclean." "Is it strange then, I ask, "to find the superstitious and self-righteous Pharisees immersing their couches for purification or themselves, after mingling in a crowd at the market or elsewhere." Milton, the celebrated Poet, says: "It is in vain alleged by those who, on the authority of Mark 7 : 4; Luke 11 : 38; have introduced the practice of affusion in baptism instead of immersion, and that to dip and sprinkle mean the same thing. Since in washing, we do not sprinkle the hands but immerse them."

Pedobaptist.—The testimonies you have produced, to confirm your views, together with the explanatory remarks, render the passages thus far, very plain. But there is one other passage

that I have heard our minister bring forward as triumphant proof, that *baptizo* means to sprinkle, that is Heb. 9 : 10. "Which stood in meats and drinks, and divers *baptisms*, (*baptismois*.)

Now I will just assume his ground, and you may answer the argument if you can. Amongst the "divers washings" (*baptismata*, *baptisms*) of the old dispensation referred to in this passage there is evidently included all the various modes of Jewish purification; and consequently the *rantismata*, or sprinklings which were the most numerous." This being the fact, the conclusion is irresistible and certain, that Paul terms these sprinklings, baptisms.

Baptist.—Your conclusions might be just, if the premises had their foundation in truth. But why should you suppose that the baptisms under the law, included all the purifications required by the law? Is this asserted here, or in any other place in the scriptures? Your position is an assumed one. You have taken for granted here the very thing to be proved, i. e. that *divers baptisms* refer to the *sprinklings*. Now, all that is necessary to refute your reasoning in this case, is to demand the proof of your premises. This begging the question, that is, taking a thing for granted, is a very common and convenient way of proving it.

But it is evident from the Mosaic ritual, that immersions were frequent among the Jews, and on some occasions required by law. Hence it is obvious, "the phrase alludes to the immersion of the different things, that by the law were to be immersed." It is also evident that if there is any word in Greek that can specifically mean immersion, it must be the word used here, as we have abundantly shown. From what we have said, it is manifest that the primary meaning of the term is not altogether impossible. Prof. Robinson translates the word washings, but refers to Lev. 11 : 32, where various things were to be cleansed by being '*put into water*.' This surely is evidence that the learned Professor supposed the Apostle to mean *immersions* in this phrase. "The term '*divers baptisms*,' Baumgarten and others rightly explain as being '*of men and of things*.'" "If this be the sense, no one will object to the idea of immersion." "That Dr. Miller and others should explain it otherwise, by making it mean immersions, sprinkling and the like, may perhaps be accounted for without much difficulty. Nevertheless, contending as he does, for the proselyte baptism of *persons*, and admitting the various ablution of *things*, he might, had he felt disposed, have found the diversity, as others do, consisting in the *subjects* and *objects* to which the ablution is applied.

Rabbi Salmon, speaking of the ablution of persons on Ex. 29, says: "not only the hands and feet were washed, but the whole body."

Starck, says: "The baptisms with the Jews were not by SPRINKLING, but, in addition to washing the whole body, an entire immersion. The Hebrew word cannot possibly signify sprinkling. Baptism is NEVER in the New Testament compared with Levitical sprinklings, but with the death and resurrection of Christ."

Schneckenburger, in mentioning the lustrations practiced among the Jews, says: "before prayer a BATHING, or at least washing the hands was common." "The Jews BATHED BEFORE entering the temple or the synagogues." Quoting Philo, who uses the words rendered BATHING, WASHING THE BODY BY BATHING. "He shows that the Samaritines did the same, LAVARE AQIS CORPOS." "For this reason," he adds: synagogues were erected by the side of rivers." "On festival occasions, they were particular in their purifications."

Theophylact says, "purifying themselves according to the custom, by bathing and fasting." Philo says, "purifying their bodies by bathings (LOUTROIS)." Tertullian speaks of Jews who BATHED every day, because they were defiled every day." Epiphanius says, "the Hemerobaptists maintained that one ought to be baptized every day in water (ENUDATI)." Justin Martyr says, "these were Pharisees, and combats their error, saying, Isaiah did not direct you to go into THE BATH, (eis balaneion,) whom not even the sea could purify."

Maimonides Mikvaoth, says: "every one that is baptized must immerse the whole body." Schneckenburger, speaking of proselyte baptism quotes the Talmud, and shows that the male and again the female were led into the water, the female up to her neck, each then immersing themselves in water; and on page 145, says, "the ordinary lustrations of the Jews were performed in the same way." In another place he observes, "the Jewish lustrations were performed by total or partial immersions."

"What, then, are we to suppose Paul meant by baptism in this passage (Heb. 9: 10,) Dr. Miller says, 'the sprinklings of blood.' We challenge him to produce a single passage in all the range of sacred and pagan literature, which shall furnish a parallel, in which baptism shall signify sprinkling with blood. How often do the sacred writers *rhetorically* name an important part, and make it stand for the whole! When the early writers attempt an examination of the various Jewish rites of purification, they always distinguish immersions from sprinklings." Thus do the Apostolical constitutions. "Theodoret, too, in his Com. on this passage, *distinguishes* between baptisms and purifications by sprinkling: "Unclean persons were *immersed* and *purified* by *sprinklings*."

Pedobaptist.—The exposition you have given of the above passages, in connexion with the appropriate remarks made, and the learned testimonies you have cited, render their import so plain, as to demand my assent. Here I must acknowledge (that in conformity to my promise when we commenced this "conversation,") I feel myself constrained, by such an amount of evidence, to accede to your views of these passages, though I would, consulting my own feelings, gladly have the testimony otherwise. But still, there are a number of passages in the Acts of the Apostles, which I have heard urged as containing insuperable objections to the idea of immersion. With your consent, I will quote these passages separately, and present the Pedobaptists' views, provided you, in reply, will give us your *ex-*position of the passages.

Baptist.—I have no objection to give you my views of the texts, if you think they will be of any service to you.

Pedobaptist.—They may be the means of convincing me that you are either right or wrong. With these remarks I will cite Acts 10: 47—“Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we”? Does not this evidently mean, *can any man forbid water to be brought in, &c.*

Baptist.—If Cornelius had wished to be affused, -sprinkled, who would have possessed the presumption to forbid his bringing water into his own house? Surely no one. This cannot be the import of the passage. It *may* mean, can any man, (although he be a Jew,) who has a private bath, tank or cistern, forbid its use, that these Gentiles should not be baptized? This construction would render it a pertinent question. But the plain import of the question I believe is simply this, “*Can any one forbid the baptism of these persons*”? Then there is nothing in this text, that requires the word “baptized” to have any other than its usual sense, *immersed.*”

Pedobaptist.—This exposition appears quite reasonable. The next case is that of the jailer, recorded in Acts 16: 33. Prof. Stuart you know says: The jailer and his household were baptized at, or in the jail, How could they have been baptized by immersion?

Baptist.—Prof. Stuart allows the “possibility” of there having been a “bath” in the jail, in which the keeper’s family were immersed. This “possibility” is all that need be asked. But this narrative not only does not present any objection to the idea of immersion; it furnishes positive evidence in its favor. The following appears to have been the order of events. Paul and Silas were thrust into the inner prison; an earthquake occurred; the jailer sprang in and fell down before Paul and Silas; he brought them out [of the prison, says Barnes]; they speak to him, and *to all that were in his house*; he then washed their stripes; baptism was next performed; and after baptism, *the company returned to the house.* (v. 34.) After instruction, then, had been given *in the house*, baptism was performed; and after baptism, *the company returned to the house.* Did they not leave the house, in order that baptism might be administered? And why did the administration of baptism require them to leave the house, if it were not *that they might go to a bath or other place convenient for immersion*?”

Pedobaptist.—I must acknowledge that it is to me wholly inexplicable, why they should leave the house to administer the

ordinance of baptism, if it was performed by sprinkling, for it appears *they returned to it*. But on the supposition they were immersed it appears very reasonable.—Still you are aware, that baptism is thought by many to mean a washing, in Acts 22 : 16. And now why tarriest thou, arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins.

Is not baptism in this place called *the washing away of sin*? And is it not evident that baptism means to wash or sprinkle? And is not this opinion confirmed by the fact that he arose straitway and was baptized? Where? Why evidently in the same room where he lay; for all the circumstances go to prove conclusively that this was the case. Not one syllable is said about their leaving the room, nor about Paul's being immersed.

Baptist.—My friend, you are aware that the spirit of inspiration has made use of the Greek word *thapto*, which signifies to bury, to describe the ordinance of baptism. And you know it is said, the rich man died, and was buried. Where? “Why evidently in the very room where he lay, for all the circumstances go to prove conclusively, that this was the case.” Not one syllable is said about their leaving the room, nor of the rich man's being entombed or covered up in the earth. “And is it not evident that burying here means to sprinkle or affuse a little” dirt upon the man? The inference we have drawn respecting the burial of the rich man, is not more rash and inconsistent, than the one you have drawn respecting Paul's baptism. Now, although there is nothing said respecting the manner the rich man was buried, still I conclude he must have been interred or covered up in the earth, because this is the meaning of the word. And for the same reason, I conclude that Paul was immersed.

Let us now look at the scope and evident meaning of the passage, “Why tarriest thou,” i. e. “Why dost thou *delay or linger or lose time*?” *Hasten—arise*, and be baptized, (immersed.) The word *arise* is obviously opposed to *tarriest*, and implies immediate motion or action. *Wash away thy sins*,—“*Immersion in pure water would have the effect of washing.*” “The word for *wash* here is *apolousai* from *louo*, the term used by the *Seventy* where the bathing of the whole body is intended, in distinction to the washing of the hands,” etc. Keeping in view the meaning of *louo*, let us read the passage:—Arise and be sprinkled,* or poured out (like wine or some liquid) and wash or bathe away thy sins. “Is not the allusion to washing totally disfig-

*Dr. Campbell.—“Had baptizo been employed in the sense of *raino*, to sprinkle, (which as far as I know, it never is in any use sacred or classical,) the expression would doubtless have been, I indeed baptize water upon you.”

ured?" We have shown that the word *baptizo*, means to immerse. Had it been so translated here, it would have been beautiful and appropriate. Finally, we will listen to Paul's description of his own baptism. "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death, therefore we are buried with him by baptism," Rom. 6 : 3, 4. Now this burying by baptism must mean immersion. But you may inquire where was he immersed? I reply, that is not material. Perhaps in a tank or bath, for they were common in that country.—But I will obligate myself to find the *bath, tank, river or pool*, where Paul was "immersed," when you will find the *grave* in which the rich man "was buried." The Bible says, that Paul was "buried by baptism," and that the rich man "died and was buried." Now I believe both of these facts, though I do not know the *body of water*, in which the one was *baptized*, or the *grave* in which the other was *buried*.

Pedobaptist.—All doubts about this last passage are now removed; I perceive, that it is quite as apposite for you to inquire where the rich man was buried, as it is for me to inquire, where Paul was immersed. But it never occurred to me before, that Paul had given us a description of his own baptism, by saying that he and his Roman brethren *were buried in baptism*. It appears to me, that this description given by Paul of his own baptism is satisfactory and decisive proof, that he was immersed. But if immersion is the only Christian baptism, how could the 3000 on the day of Pentecost, (Acts 2,) have been baptized by twelve men? Where was this immersion performed? "Was it in streams or brooks, near Jerusalem?" We think not, for there is not one word that even intimates that such was the fact. Pedobaptists generally think it could not have been within the city; for say they, that was built "on the top of a hill, far from any brook, or river deep enough for immersion." Such being the fact, it is wholly incredible that the 3000 were immersed the same day.

Baptist.—I would just remark here, should there be any difficulty in accounting for so large a number's being immersed in one day, the same, or a great difficulty rests against the theory and practice of our opponents. They tell us that "the children of converts were baptized together with their parents. This must have greatly increased the number to be sprinkled and consequently makes the account more incredible." But you inquire, "how could the 3000 on the day of Pentecost have been immersed by twelve men," as though it was wholly incredible. With as much propriety I might inquire, how could

Abraham at the advanced age of 99 years, perform the rite of circumcision upon all the men that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, *in the self same day*, that he received the command, Gen. 17: 23. (Those born in his own house, amounted to 318; see Gen. 14: 14). This must have been more difficult, and must have required more time, than for each of the apostles to immerse 250 persons in one day.—“Again how was it possible (1 Kings 8: 63,) for Solomon on the day of the dedication of the temple to offer a sacrifice of 2 and 20,000 oxen, and 120,000 sheep?” We can easily conceive how these things might have been done, and that is sufficient for our purpose.

You intimate, that Jerusalem is a place very destitute of water. From what source have you derived this information? From the well known fact, that it was a very populous city; and “the metropolis of a flourishing country, a country too, whose prescribed religion required the constant use of water for purifications and ablutions, and all of whose male inhabitants were required to assemble there three times every year;” or from the historical account of the many pools and fountains, which the city is said to have contained; among which, might be mentioned the molton sea, furnished by Solomon for the service of the temple, containing about seven hundred barrels of water; and the ten other layers, each of which held between nine and ten barrels; and the fountain of Siloam,* whose waters issuing from a rock were received into *two large pools*, and thence glided into the Kidron a considerable stream which run along the valley on the east of the city; besides these, there was the pool of *Bethesda*, which according to Brown and Maundrell, was 360 feet long, 120 broad, and 8 feet deep. In addition to these, we might add, that it was so common a thing for the Jews in the city to have tanks or cisterns near their dwellings for bathing, and other private uses, that cistern digging was followed as a business. We see that there could have been no want of water in the city, and yet there are men who labor to lodge in ‘ignorant minds’ the belief that Jerusalem was so sadly destitute of water that the 3000 could not have been immersed.

Again it is evident, that there could have been no want of time, for there was only one short sermon delivered by Peter immediately after 9 o’clock A. M.—(see Acts 2d,)—so that the principal part of the day was before them. Since, therefore, there were *places, water, and time, sufficient*, the twelve Apostles

* According to Josephus, this fountain “had water in it in abundance.”—*Jewish War*, Book 5th, Chap. 4th.

might have performed the work in three hours,* and that too, without leaving the precincts of the temple, for there was the molten sea, the ten other lavers and "dipping room;" (conveniences abundant for their accommodation.) But there is strong probability, that all the administrators were present on that memorable occasion; (see the previous chapter,) if so, there were 82 baptizers, and consequently not more than 37 candidates for each. That being the case, they might all have been baptized in twenty-five minutes. The pool of Bethesda alone was sufficient to accommodate all the administrators, etc. And finally, the 3,000 might have been baptized in private baths.

As "*the burden of proof* lies on those that object to immersion, can they prove that immersion could not possibly be practised on this occasion?" Hear the language of Prof. Stuart: "It is true, we do not know that baptism was performed by the apostles only, nor that all of the 3,000 were baptized before the going down of the sun.† The work may have extended into the evening; and so many being engaged in it, and more time being given, there is a probability that the work should have been performed, although immersion was practised."

"Suppose, however, there were a difficulty in explaining this baptism, inasmuch as the notice is very summary, is there *any thing* better than *mere conjecture* to show, that they were sprinkled?" As the exact arrangements for this baptism are not known, all that is necessary is, to "show what *might* be done in various ways, so that there could be no necessity of departing from the usual rite of baptism." * * * "But is there any thing in the whole Bible to prove, that it was by sprinkling?" Why was there not some indication in the language of the narrator, to advertise the reader of so remarkable a departure from the customary baptism? In the controversy between the Eastern and Western Church, why did not

* The ordinance has been frequently administered in less ratio of time than this. We have seen forty candidates immersed by one administrator at the rate of about two a minute.

† "It is no where asserted in the scriptures that THREE THOUSAND were either CONVERTED or BAPTIZED on this day (the day of Pentecost.) We are not informed whether FIFTY or FIVE HUNDRED, or MORE were BAPTIZED on this occasion. We are simply told, in reference to those who were then 'pricked in their hearts,' who 'gladly received the apostles' word,' that THEY were baptized. 'And,' we are further informed, 'the same day there were ADDED'—not were baptized—'about 3,000 souls.' The scriptures also warrant us in saying, that the apostles, and the one hundred and twenty disciples, mentioned in the preceding chapter, were all present; and as many others in Jerusalem, and in that region, as could conveniently be at the feast of Pentecost."—(Fuller on communion: note, p. 71.)

Bloomfield says: "We need not suppose ALL [of the 3,000] were baptized."

Dr. Starck, court preacher at Darmstadt well remarks, that, "In the history of those converted by Peter's preaching on the day of Pentecost, there is nothing which compels us to infer, that all these were baptized on the spot, and on the same day, which is taken for granted by all those who would prove sprinkling, from this passage."

the Romans teach the Greeks the true meaning of the Greek word, and show them, that the re-baptism of a "sprinkled christian" was an insult to Peter and the three thousand? Why did not Cyprian, when called upon by Magnus to decide, whether persons who were not immersed in their baptism, were legitimate christians, instead of reasoning from the *Old Testament*, and from the nature of the symbolical act, settle the matter at once, by saying, that the apostles, on the day of Pentecost, and in private houses and prisons, baptized by sprinkling or pouring? He lived too near the apostles to dream of such a thing. *There is not a trace of such an opinion in all the Latin or Greek Fathers, though they often had occasion to discuss the validity of baptism that was not by immersion.*.. Could Novatian, Cyprian, Cornelius, Chrysostom, and others, have neglected so capital a point in discussing the validity of pouring in clinic baptism, if things were actually as Pedobaptist writers conjecture? Bretschneider, in his *Theology*, vol. 2, p. 686, felt himself compelled to say, the "conjecture, that the three thousand were sprinkled, is too much of a conjecture to be trusted."

Schneckenburger, in his *Proselyte Baptism*, inquires: "Did the apostles administer baptism to the three thousand in one day, or did the three thousand perform a lustration upon themselves?" and in a note, "this is more probable than that they were sprinkled." What must be the impression of that erudit critic, who had made deeper researches than any other man living into the nature of Jewish lustrations, to induce him thus to maintain that of all conjectures, that sprinkling is one of the most improbable."

"But there are facts on record in the history of the church, which remove every difficulty in the way of the immersion of the entire three thousand."

"On the great sabbath of the Easter festival the 16th day of April, A. D. 403, Chrysostom, with the assistance of the clergy of his own church, baptized by immersion 300 persons. Yes, one man assisted only by his presbyters, in one day and in one place, immersed 3000 persons; and that too, notwithstanding the christians were twice attacked by furious soldiers, the enemies of Chrysostom."

"So in 496, Remigius, bishop of Rheims, baptized in one day, by immersion, Clovis, king of France, and three thousand of his subjects."

I will only remark, in relation to the above historical facts, that the baptisms referred to were administered on Easter day, to commemorate the resurrection of Christ; and it was common to reserve all the baptisms of the year for that day. Hence, the number of candidates who came forward at the same time."

In view of the above facts and the examination of alleged improbabilities, I ask what right we have to depart from the observance of the primitive rite of baptism, as prescribed by our Savior?

Pedobaptist.—Your explanations and remarks, showing what might be done, and the conclusion you have drawn from the fact that none of the Latin and Greek fathers ever referred to

the baptism on the day of Pentecost, to justify pouring in *clinic* baptism; together with the import of the term, and the historical facts you have cited, (which by the by, I never heard of before,) seem to me abundantly sufficient, to render it not only possible, but *altogether probable*, that the 3000 were immersed on the day of Pentecost. But then what do you think of the remarks of Prof. Stuart, the man you have so often quoted to fortify your positions; he says, "For myself, I cheerfully admit, that *baptizo* in the New Testament, when applied to the rite of baptism, does, in all probability, involve the idea, that this rite was usually performed by immersion, but not always. I say *usually* and not *always*, for to say more than this, the tenor of some of the narrations, particularly in Acts 10: 47, 48. 16: 32, 33, and 2: 41, seem to me to forbid. I cannot read these examples, without the distinct conviction, that *immersion* was not practised on these occasions, but *washing* or *affusion*."

Baptist.--The passages above referred to, we believe we have shown to be entirely consistent with the idea, that immersion was practised. But where are the clear evidences that produced the "distinct conviction" in his own mind, that on these occasions immersion was not practised. Has Prof. S., exhibited these evidences, if so, what are they? The reader will doubtlessly be surprised, to learn that these evidences is nothing better than mere conjecture. Indeed it could not possibly be otherwise, for there is nothing said in these passages, touching the manner in which the rite was performed. Is it not passing strange, that a man of Prof. Stuart's attainments, should consider mere *conjectural evidence* sufficient to warrant him, in deviating from what is in all probability the requirement of Christ. Again hear the Professor's admission, when speaking of the circumstances connected with the administration of the rite in the New Testament. "I find none, I am quite ready to concede, which seems absolutely to determine that immersion was not practised." Since then, Prof. Stuart admits that immersion was, *in all probability*, the primitive rite of baptism; and since he is quite willing to admit, that there is nothing in the circumstances of baptism that absolutely excludes the idea, that immersion was practised; and since he has not, nor cannot prove, from a single example in the New Testament, that baptism is any thing other than immersion;—"we hold that every principle of fair interpretation, requires him to explain the doubtful passages by those that are clear; to extend the usual meaning of the word to every passage in which that word occurs, unless there is something in the cir-

cumstances which undeniably demands a different interpretation."

Pedobaptist.—I must say, I know not how to reconcile Prof. Stuart's *practice* with his concessions, but as this is not my business, I will present some objections to immersion, which are thought by many deserving of particular attention; but before I proceed to this, (should you deem this a proper time,) I should be pleased to hear you advance your reasons (which you promised,) for not believing the affirmation so confidently made by Pedobaptists, that the legitimate meaning of *baptizo* is to *wash* and *cleanse* as well as *immerse*.

Baptist.—We have already alluded to the fact, that washing may frequently be regarded as a consequential meaning of *baptizo*; as the thing to be washed, is generally dipped in water.* The same remark may be made with regard to *cleanse*. The case of Naaman has been instanced (see page 53, and the note.) But as it is confidently asserted, that *baptizo* signifies to *cleanse* and *wash*, etc. I would ask, "does *baptizo* mean to *cleanse*, when we speak of baptizing a bucket into a fountain, in order to fill it? or when we speak of baptizing a ship, so that it becomes engulfed in the sea? Does it mean to *cleanse* or *wash*, when Plutarch relates that the soldiers baptized wine from casks with cups in order to drink?—that a general baptized his hands into blood and wrote an inscription—that weapons were found, two hundred years after the battle of Orchomenus, baptized in the earth? Is this its meaning in Josephus, where he says that Simon baptized the sword into his own throat? or in [Aquila,] Job 9: 31. "Thou shalt baptize me in the mire," or in Hippocrates, where he orders a blister to be baptized in milk and Egyptian ointment?—Surely, these baptisms do not endorse the assertion, that baptism is a *generic term* and imports the application of water in any manner. These examples with others that might be quoted, show that *baptizo* as well as *bapto*, signifies to *dip* or *immerse* and has no allusion to *water whatever*, except that element is expressed or implied.

Pedobaptist.—It must, I believe, be conceded by all unprejudiced men, who will examine the evidences you have produced, that *to wash* and *cleanse* are not the *primary, literal* meanings of the word *baptizo*; indeed, I do not see how any candid man

* Altingius says: "The word baptism—properly signifies IMMERSION; improperly, by a metonymy of the end, washing." Beza.—"To plunge into, to dip into and take out again, whence WASHING BOTH FOLLOW." Alstedius.—"To immerse and not to wash except by consequence." These are the testimonies of learned Pedobaptists.

can doubt this, for in most of the cases of baptism you have instanced, it is *impossible* to take the meaning of either wash or cleanse, out of the passages. The same might be said with regard to sprinkling, pouring, wetting, &c. But, as I intimated to you, that I had a number of objections to present against immersion as the only baptism, which, by the advocates of sprinkling, are deemed weighty, I will proceed to my purpose, by saying: that "Christ intended his people should be free from inconvenient and burdensome rites; but immersion would often be inconvenient, and sometimes impracticable." What, I would ask, must be done in such cases?

Baptist.—It is true the numerous rites and ceremonies of the Jewish dispensation, together with the time, trouble, toil, and expense involved in this observance, are abolished. Since the observance of these burdensome rites and ceremonies are done away, the founder of the gospel dispensation has instituted only two external rites, baptism and the Lord's Supper.—Though he has made "immersion as essential to baptism, as roundness is to a ball," "shall we therefore charge him with imposing upon his people a yoke like that which rested upon the children of Israel, too grievous to be borne?"

The mere mention of the "inconveniences" attending the scriptural observance of this rite, causes those to smile, who have tested the weight of this objection by actual experience.

As it regards the impracticability of immersion in some countries, and, in certain circumstances, in all countries facts will abundantly show to a reflecting mind that this objection is of little value to its possessor. Immersion is practised at this day amid the torrid suns of Asia and Africa, and the perpetual snows of Siberia. And whenever life or health would be endangered by the administration of this ordinance, it should be postponed or entirely omitted. Should the providence of God deprive any one of this privilege, then it would be the duty of that person devoutly to acquiesce in this providence. "A *willing mind* is accepted of God according to what a man hath." If a person have not the physical ability or opportunity, to observe this ordinance, then of course it is not required. The privation in this case would be no greater, than in many others where christians are denied by sickness or other causes the privilege of attending the public worship of the sanctuary, and of laboring for the conversion of sinners; or, where one is "prevented by the loss of sight from obeying the command to search the scriptures."

Pedobaptist.—Although this answer of yours is perfectly sat-

isfactory, yet in some respects your denomination are quite inconsistent with themselves, for instance, "their practice with respect to the Lord's Supper, is inconsistent with their strict adherence to the primitive mode of baptism. They do not observe the requisitions of Christ with regard to 'the time' or 'the place,' or 'the posture,' of celebrating the ordinance of the supper—nor do they use the same kind of 'bread' or 'wine.'"

Baptist.—My friend, in reply I would say, the command of our Lord, "THIS DO YE in remembrance of me,"—"had no reference whatever to the *circumstances* of celebrating the supper; it referred to the eating of bread and the drinking of wine in commemoration of his death, without any allusion 'to time,' 'place,' or 'manner.' So in relation to baptism; Christ commands his followers to be *baptized* [immersed,] without reference to time, place or manner. In each case, *we are bound to do just what he commanded.* In the Lord's Supper, we are commanded to partake of bread and wine, in grateful remembrance of Christ; in baptism we are commanded to *perform THE ACT REPRESENTED by the word baptize.*"*

This objection is groundless; it rests on the assumption, "that *immersion* is only a *circumstance* of baptism, while it has been already shown, *it is not a circumstance attending it, but belongs to the nature of baptism itself.*"

Finally, this objection is a plain admission that the primitive baptism was immersion.

Pedobaptist.—Without attempting to reply to your very able and appropriate answer, I will present my next objection. "Immersion is unfavorable to collected serious thought in the person who submits to it; and makes on the spectators an impression adverse to religion."

Baptist.—In regard to the first part of the objection, multitudes, "many of whom were timid and delicate females," have, "with placid brow and unflinching step, gone down into the water," and *been buried with Christ in baptism,* and now stand ready to "testify to the serene composure, and the tender solemnity of their feelings," and the peace of mind they enjoyed on that occasion. The ordinance is so beautifully emblematical of the foundation of the believer's hope, the death and resurrection of Christ, and consequently so full of "rich and precious instruction," as to impart a "sustaining, elevating power," which causes its subjects to rise superior to the infirmities which, under other circumstances, would probably disarm and overpower them

*Prof. Jewell,

With reference to the latter part of the objection, that the impression produced on the spectators, is unfavorable to religion, must surely be regarded as the offspring of prejudice; as it is every where contradicted by experience. Who that ever witnessed the administration of this ordinance, did not deeply feel that the scene was most solemn and sacred. The venerated divines Andrew Fuller and Dr. Steadman state, in their own account of their lives, that the impressions they received on seeing persons baptized, i. e. immersed, were the means, under God, of their conversion. "Thousands of others, also, have been led, by the same means, to embrace the Savior, who was thus set forth before their eyes, as 'buried and risen again' for their redemption." But where have you ever met with the account of a person who received his first permanent religious impressions from witnessing the sprinkling of an infant or adult?

"Some have even gone so far as to speak" of the rite of immersion as "indecent." It would be well for such persons to reflect, that if there had been no departure from the primitive rite of baptism, as confessedly practised by the Apostles, and the Christian world for many centuries, such a sentiment as this, would never have found a "local habitation" in the mind of any disciple of Christ. It would also be well to remind such persons, that they should be cautious how they urge this sentiment, lest they be found guilty of stigmatizing an ordinance of Christ, with the epithet "indecent." If Christians cherish such sentiments and feelings as these against this gospel ordinance, how indecent, in their view, must HE be who instituted it, and the Christian world who practised it generally for *fifteen centuries*, and even *those* who now contend for its observance.

Pedobaptist.—My friend, a sense of duty induces me to acknowledge that you have thus far answered the objections presented very conclusively. But the hour has arrived when my presence is absolutely required at home. It is unnecessary for me to say, that I have been much gratified as well as edified with this long conversation. But as I have many more objections to urge against your peculiar sentiments, with your permission, I should like to resume this conversation, at as early an opportunity as will suit your convenience.

Baptist.—If agreeable, please call at an early hour to-morrow evening. I shall then probably be at leisure.

CONVERSATION RESUMED.

Baptist.—My dear sir, I am gratified to see you so early ; especially as I am at leisure and you have informed me that you have more objections to present. I hope I may be able to answer them in a satisfactory manner. Will you please to proceed?

Pedobaptist.—My brother, the objection I now present, is thought, by many Pedobaptists, to be insuperable. "There is no express command in the New Testament limiting us to immersion. Had it been the design of Christ that his people should confine themselves exclusively to this mode of administration; why did he not *so plainly* make known his will, that there could be no mistake about it."

Baptist.—Surely, this objection can have no weight with you, or any one, except those, who will not admit what we have ascertained by definite and irrefragable evidence, that the only proper, legitimate import of the term baptizo, is immerse, overwhelm. If this has not been satisfactorily determined, then it is absolutely impossible to ascertain the meaning of any Greek word.—When under the law they were required to sprinkle blood and water upon the leprous person, and to pour oil upon his head, it appears that no farther explanation was necessary. The words pour and sprinkle were so definite, that they could not reasonably misapprehend their meaning. Baptizo is equally as definite in its import, as either of the above words, and as explicit and unequivocal in its meaning as our English word immerse. Prof. Stuart cheerfully admits that it does in all probability signify, to immerse. Now admitting the truth of this concession, I ask, what right has any man or class of men to go contrary to what is in all probability the requirement of Christ? For to suppose that Jesus Christ used words out of their proper signification, is neither more nor less than to suppose that he intended to mislead and deceive his hearers, a conclusion at which every pious heart revolts. We are led then, to the irresistible conclusion, that when Christ said to the Apostles "Go teach all nations baptizing," &c. he commanded them to immerse believers or disciples ; for we are very confident that that is the import of the phrase. Again, the act of immersion

cannot be expressed in the Greek language more plainly than it is in the New Testament. Such being the fact, we must conclude, that Christ intended that we should be immersed when he commanded us to be baptized. The word he employed to represent this ordinance, is as definite and specific in its import, as any word in the language.* Should the Rantist object to this, "we would argue on this point with him as

*The following Greek words and their compounds, most of which occur in the Septuagint of the Old and the Greek of the New Testament, are used generally "with reference to the application of water for various purposes, viz: *Raino*, *Rantizo*, *Cheo*, *Echeo*, *Nipto*, *Louo*, *Pluno*, *Bapto* and *Baptizo*, *Agnizo*, *Kathairo*, and some others of less note. Now, in so many words used in reference to water, is there not *one* of them of such definite import, as to determine one particular application or use of water?" Let us examine the use of some of these words in Scripture.

1. "Sprinkle and its derivatives occur 62 times in the Old and New Testament:—31 times it is *raino* in the Greek, 23 times the compounds of *cheo*, and 8 times other words, but not once *bapto* or *baptizo*."

2. "To *pour* with its derivatives occurs 152 times:—94 times it is *cheo* and its compounds, 58 times other words and phrases. Of these there are 27 varieties, but not once *bapto* or *baptizo*."

3. "To *wash* occurs 139 times:—38 times it is *nipto*, face, hands, or feet; 49 times, *louo*, the body; 44 times, *pluno*, garments, or such like; 5 times, *bapto* or *baptizo* the effect of immersion, 3 times *cheo* and *chruso* metaphorically."

4. "To *dip*, occurs with its derivatives, 22 times:—Once it is *moluno*, properly to *stain*, as when Joseph's coat was *stained*, our translation "dipped in the blood of a kid." It is 21 times *bapto* or *baptizo*. Never once *rino* to sprinkle, *cheo* to pour, *npto* to wash the face, hands or feet, *louo* to wash the body, *pluno* to wash garments, or any of their compounds or derivatives."

5. "To *plunge* occurs but once, and then it is *bapto*."

6. "*Tebel* or *lavai* in the Hebrew Old Testament occurs 17 times:—In the Septuagint it is 16 times translated by *bapto* or *baptizo*, once by *moluno*, to dye. Junins and Tremmelius translated it 16 times by *tingo*, *immergo*, and *demergo*; and it is translated 16 times in English by dip and plunge, once by dyed."

"In the English Old and New Testament [as we have seen] the word *sprinkle* occurs 62 times. The word *pour* and its derivatives 152 times. To *wash* and its derivatives, 139 times. To *dip*, with its derivatives, 22 times. To *plunge* once. Now the question that determines the point is, did the translators, in one instance, translate the same word to sprinkle and to dip? We positively say *no*." Again, did they ever, in one instance, translate the *same* word as signifying to dip and to pour? We positively answer *no*. *Bapto* and *baptizo* are never translated either to sprinkle, or to pour. Again, *Raino* and *Rantizo* are never once translated to dip, immerse, or plunge." From these facts it is evident, "that in the judgment of the translators, these words are so definitely expressive of certain actions, that they never could be translated into our language by one and the same word. Sprinkling and pouring are actions so nigh to each other, and in effect so much the same, that *Raino* and the compounds of *Cheo*, are both translated *sprinkle*. But so impassable the gulph between either *pouring* or *sprinkling* and *dipping*, that never once is *raino*

we do with the Universalist. To the latter, we would say, you deny that the words used in the New Testament to denote the duration of future punishment, express with certainty the idea of endless duration. Give us, then, words which can express it with *more* certainty. If you can, we yield the point for which we have contended. If you cannot, you charge upon the richest language in the world, the singular fault of lacking a term to express definitely an idea familiar to every mind. You virtually declare that idea to be inexpressible. To the Rantist we would say, you deny that the term *Baptizo* denotes the idea of immersion specifically and with certainty. Give us, then, a term that denotes it with more certainty. If you can, we yield our cause. If you cannot, you virtually declare a simple act, known to all nations, and familiar to every mind, to be inexpressible in the Greek language.

"This is a fair challenge. It brings the exegetical argument within a narrow compass. A child can understand it, and all may see, that, in the position we take, far from being so bigoted as to contend merely for the *mode* of an ordinance, we contend for baptism itself, for *all that* constitutes its essential nature, its beauty and its dignity."

Pedobaptist.—Instead of stopping to notice your excellent reply to my objection, I would inquire, why should we "trouble ourselves about a question of much or little water?" And again, as baptism is a "little punctilio," a subject that produces

chco, louo, nipto, or pluno, translated dip, immerse, or plunge."

Hence it is manifest from these facts, that if our Savior intended to enjoin immersion exclusively on his disciples, *baptizo* is the very word he should have made use of, as there is none that can more definitely express the action;

Again, had he intended in this ordinance that water should be applied in any manner, he would probably have made use of the word *agnizo* to purify, or *kathairo* to cleanse, for these words express no definite manner of applying water. Now as he did not use an indefinite term the unavoidable conclusion is, that "he did not command an indefinite action to be performed; and as he did not use a word that definitely signified to *pour* or *sprinkle*, he did not command those actions to be performed; but as he adopted a word that definitely signified to dip or immerse, he commanded definitely this action and this only to be performed."

Since our Savior selected a word the most definite in the language to express his will, and since that word literally signifies to dip or immerse, and since he has described none but believers in Christ as fit recipients of the rite, it follows that he does not sanction any thing as Christian baptism, but the immersion of a proper subject in water, agreeably to his command. (The quotation marks will show that we are indebted to A. Campbell for the greater part of this *note*.)

much excitement when agitated, ought we not therefore to cease conversing about it?

Baptist—My friend, baptism is not “a question of much or little water.” The only question on this subject is, what constitutes Christian baptism? And, as this has been ascertained by indubitable evidence, to be the immersion of a believer, it follows that it is absolutely necessary to have water enough for the administration of the rite or it cannot be performed. Those who do not regard baptism as a mere trifle or “non-essential,” will no doubt still continue to urge its importance on suitable occasions. But those who deem it a mere trifle or *non essential*, I should think, would be really ashamed to become excited by it. Can it be possible that any thing which Jehovah commands man to do, is nonessential, or of so little consequence as not to deserve his attention or conversation?

Pedobaptist.—My Pedobaptist friends say, “what is the use of conversing about this subject? It surely can make no difference in what manner water is applied in baptism: if it be but applied”

Baptist.—Here we would remark, “that if the mode of reasoning adopted by those, who maintain, that baptism means any application of water, whatever be the mode, were universally employed, the character of our philology would be utterly ruined. Let the same *principle* be conceded to Unitarians and Universalists, in the exposition of disputed passages, and no parade about the laws of language and *usus loquendi*, will be able to uphold the pillars of orthodoxy. To strip the matter of its learned dignity, and make it plain to the most common-sense view of the subject, we will give a specimen of this mode of criticism in plain English. We take the word *to fly* and maintain, that it does not mean any *one* kind of motion, as that by means of *wings*, but that it merely expresses *motion of any kind*. *Movement* is the radical idea. The *usus loquendi* shows, that it is said indifferently, that ‘the snow flies,’ ‘the dust flies,’ ‘the timbers fly,’ ‘the stones fly,’ ‘a man flies at another in a rage,’ ‘the carriage flies through the streets,’ ‘a man flies back from his engagements,’ ‘time flies,’ and among the rest, ‘*birds fly*’ All this can be made out in a tenfold clearer light, than the position we are combatting.”

“If baptism means ‘any application of water,’ it would indeed have puzzled a Greek to find out what it meant when used, as it often is, of a ship. How could he divine, whether it meant, that a vessel was *wet* by launching, or that it was *washed* externally by the waves, or internally by the crew, or that it sprung a leak and *wet* the cargo, or that rain *wet* the sails and rigging and deck, or that a surge swept the deck? But, according to the view of learned critics, the nature of the word is such, that it can have but one meaning, viz: *that it went under water*; and this is its invariable meaning, according to classic usage.

“It is to us a matter of indifference whether the word be said to have *one* signification or *many* significations, provided the many be included in the one.”—*Christian Review*, Vol. 3, pp. 97, 98.

Pedobaptist.—My friend, your illustrations designed to show that baptism cannot import the application of water in any

manner, but that it must mean immersion, are the most decisive that I have ever heard. But I presume you are aware, that very many Pedobaptists affirm that *sprinkle* is one definition of baptizo. Is not this a fact?

Baptist.—My brother, we have already given the lexicographical definition of baptizo, and said enough, it would seem, to convince any candid mind, that baptizo cannot fairly be rendered to sprinkle. But I will proceed to show you how Pedobaptists attempt to make it out. The Greek language formerly came to us through the channel of the Latin; i. e. Latin definitions were given to Greek words, and English definitions to Latin words. For example:

BAPTIZO. Mergo, immergo abluo, lavo.

Mergo, to put under water, sink, dip in, duck, immerse.

Immergo, to plunge, to drench or dip over head and ears; to drown, immerge, sink.

Abluo, to wash clean, wash away, purify, remove, blot out.

Lavo, to wash, rinse, bathe, besprinkle, purge.

Now *Lavo* is a secondary and consequential meaning of Baptizo; and the fourth signification of this word is given by Ainsworth's Latin Lexicon to *besprinkle*. This definition he derives from this expression in a Latin poet: "Tabellas lacrymis lavi;" "Thou besprinklest the letter with tears," which ought to have been rendered *wash*. A similar expression is rendered to wash in the Gospel. "She *washed* his feet with her tears." Again, this definition is obtained by passing the word through two languages, and then taking about the twentieth definition. Now, I object to this principle of interpretation.

Pedobaptist.—My brother, why do you object to this rule of interpretation? I suppose it is because it gives besprinkle as one definition of baptizo.

Baptist.—I object to it not on that account; but because it proceeds upon the principle that the most remote definition assigned to a word by Lexicons, after passing it through one or two languages, is as truly the *literal import* of the word as the first or primary signification. Now, on this principle, I affirm that it is utterly impossible to ascertain the literal meaning of most words.

To illustrate this, let us pass the word *dip* into the French language, and then back into the English again. The French according to Boyer have given this word four definitions to express its various uses.

DIP. Tremper, plonger, mouiller, engager.

Tremper, to dip, soak, imbue, bathe.

Plonger, to dip, duck, immerse, plunge, overwhelm, cast into, *stab*.

Mouiller, to anchor, drop anchor, cast anchor, &c.

Engager, to pawn, mortgage, pledge, engage, enlist, fight.

Suppose now, that a gentleman employed as translator for one of the French Journals, should in translating an account, from one of our Religious periodicals, of a Clergyman's *dipping* a man on the Sabbath, instead of giving the plain import of the term *dip*, should inform his readers that the Rev. gentleman *foug't* or *stab'd* a man on the Sabbath. I ask now, would he give the true meaning of the word *dip*?*

* It is my impression that I have somewhere in my reading met with a similar illustration to the above.

Pedobaptist.—Certainly not, and he had no right to translate it thus, because that is not its primary, literal meaning.

Baptist.—My friend, he might with propriety plead, that he had the same right to translate it to *fight* or *st b*, that Pedobaptists have to render its corresponding Greek term baptizo to sprinkle; and that he had adopted precisely the same rule of interpretation in rendering this word, that Pedobaptists observe in defining baptizo.

Pedobaptist.—My brother, does not the word *dip* form a rare exception to this rule of translation. If it does not, it will be easy to expose it, by producing other similar examples or illustrations. Can you produce any?

Baptist.—I could produce a multitude of similar examples to the word *dip*, to prove the invalidity of this principle of interpretation. Let us examine this principle by passing the following important Greek words in the New Testament through the Latin into the English.

Pisteuo, to believe. *Agapao*, to love. *Aionios*, eternal, everlasting.

PISTEUO. Credo, fide, committo.

Now, as a specimen of the English definitions Ainsworth appends to *committo*, we give the following: *to match, to air, to expose, to offend.*

Suppose now, that a Pedobaptist minister should urge upon the celebrated infidel Abner Kneeland, the important duty of believing the Gospel of Jesus Christ in order to be saved; and Kneeland should reply, "I do believe the Gospel of Jesus Christ." The Pedobaptist inquires; "how do you make that out?" In precisely the same manner, replies Kneeland, "that you make out that you have been baptized. I find that *to expose* is one of the definitions Ainsworth gives of *committo*, the last Latin definition of the Greek *PISTEUO*. Now as I *expose* the Gospel of Jesus Christ to ridicule and show its absurdity, it follows therefore that I am a believer; for that is the import of the term *Pisteuo*, by the same rule of interpretation that sprinkle is the import of baptizo. Hence if you baptize persons when you sprinkle them, by parity of reasoning I *believe* the Gospel when I *expose* it to ridicule." Again, by this rule to *offend* is to *believe*. Read Matt 18: 6 by substituting believe for offend, you will find by this principle of interpretation, "that it were better for man that a millstone were hanged about his neck," etc., than to believe one of Christ's disciples. We will next take *agapao*.

AGAPAO. Deligo, amo, osculor.

Now *osculor* means to kiss. It follows by this rule of interpretation that as Judas kissed Jesus Christ, he loved him, and as he *exp sed* him, by this act, to the malice of the Jews he believed him.

We will finally conclude this illustration with the Greek word *aionios*.

AIONIOS. Eternus.

Eternus, eternal, continual, perpetual, lasting, of long continuance, *during life*.

Universalists contend that *aionios* when applied to punishment means during life. Now, if Pedobaptists are justified in interpreting baptizo to sprinkle; for the same reason then, Universalists who follow their example ought to be justified in rendering *aionios*, during life. And Pedobaptists cannot, consistently, say aught against them for rendering it thus, so long as they interpret *baptizo* to sprinkle. It appears evident to me that if we were to carry out this principle of interpretation, it would not only destroy the philology and utility of our language, but involve us in a dilemma similar to that experienced by the builders of Babel, when their language was confounded. Hence we see the absolute necessity of adopting the purport of the rule of interpretation, which I have before mentioned, viz: *That the primary, literal import of a word is always*

to be taken as the true one, unless it can be shown by conclusive evidence that such a meaning could not possibly have been intended by the author. By this rule, Pedobaptists would find that *baptizo* means to immerse; and Universalists, that *aiōnios* means eternal. But if there is no certain evidence that baptism is immersion, then there is no certain evidence that *aiōnios* is eternal or ever lasting, or that *pisteuo* is to believe, or that *agapao* is to love, or even that our English word *dup* is to plunge or immerse.

Pedobaptist.—I am very willing, my friend, to admit your rule of interpretation, and also the general correctness of your illustrations going to show the ridiculous absurdity of passing a word through one or two languages, and then taking one of its most distant lexicographical definitions as its true and literal import. But I will proceed with my objections. Prof. Stuart, as I presume you are aware, represents the Baptists as “breaking the church in pieces by contending for rites and forms.” Is not this a fact?

Baptist.—Is it a fact that the Baptist denomination have broken “the church in pieces, by contending for rites and forms?” This surely is a grave charge; and if true, they are certainly deserving of censure. Let us examine this charge, and see whether it can be sustained. Both denominations maintain that the Lord’s Supper should be celebrated, and that too, by baptized persons, and those believers; but neither party contends that the ordinance is not celebrated, unless the bread and wine are partaken of in a reclining posture. Again, both denominations contend for the right of baptism. The Baptists, that believers are the only fit recipients of the rite. The Pedobaptists, not only that believers, but that their infant offspring are proper subjects of this ordinance; though the Bible and the voice of history are silent respecting it for the first two centuries. The Baptists again contend for the rite of immersion, which all ecclesiastical historians affirm was the primitive form. The Pedobaptists, not only for the rite of immersion, but for the rite of sprinkling, and the rite of pouring, in direct opposition, as we have seen, to the import of the term, and the general practice of the church for fifteen centuries. Here it will be observed, that the Pedobaptists contend for at least three rites more than the Baptists; and neither of them found in the church, until about the commencement of the third century. Now, we are quite ready to admit that what has broken the church in pieces, and caused various denominations, has been the the “contending for rites and forms,” not instituted by Christ, nor found in the Apostolic and primitive churches. On whom now does the heinous sin of “breaking the church in pieces” rest? On those who obey the injunction, “earnestly contend for the faith once

delivered to the saints," and who "keep the ordinances as they were delivered?" Or on those who, while they maintain that the Bible is a sufficient rule of faith and practice, and that the rite or form is *nonessential*; yet tenaciously adhere to a particular rite, which the most learned of their own denomination admit, is unauthorized by the word of God? You will observe here, my friend, that while the Baptists contend for "one Lord, one faith, and one baptism," the Pedobaptists contend for one Lord, two faiths, and at least three baptisms. Who now "contend for rights and forms?" Is it not evident that if all Christians had contended for "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," that the church would not have been "broken in pieces?" On whom then rests the guilt of these divisions?

Pedobaptist.—My dear friend, you greatly mistake our views, when you suppose that we contend for "three baptisms." We contend only for *one baptism*, and that having several modes, such as sprinkling, pouring, etc., we do not contend, however, that any mode is essential. But you contend for one particular form of baptism. As I know not what you mean by our contending for "two faiths." I should like to hear you explain that.

Baptist.—We contend that personal faith in the subject, is an indispensable prerequisite to baptism. You contend for this, in a part of those whom you baptize, (sprinkle) and the others you sprinkle on another faith, i. e. the faith of the parent. These are the two faiths of which we spoke.

As it regards modes of baptism, my brother, you must either contend for "a baptism that has *no* mode, or a baptism that *is* mode and nothing *but* mode," "or a baptism that has many modes." If for the first, then you must contend for a nonentity; since there can be "no external rite, without a mode of existence." If for the second, it becomes a question of importance to know "what that mode is; for without that mode we have no baptism." If for the third, i. e. a "baptism that has many modes," such "as washing, sprinkling, pouring, etc., then the candidate must be immersed, poured, sprinkled, washed, etc., or he is not baptized. Because sprinkling is only one mode of the baptism which has many. Hence if water is only sprinkled upon him, he has received but a "small part of baptism." Now, unless it can be proved "that a part, and a small part is equal to the whole, his baptism must be very imperfect and defective."

Again, your denomination maintain, not only that sprinkling is one mode of baptism, and that pouring is one mode of baptism, etc. but that sprinkling is actually baptism, etc. Now if sprinkling is one mode of baptism, and at the same time is baptism itself, then if we substitute sprinkling for baptism, we have a *sprinkling mode* of sprinkling and a *pouring mode* of sprinkling, and an *immersion mode* of sprinkling, etc. The same may be said in regard to pouring and immersion. This makes consummate nonsense. Surely no one will contend for so gross an absurdity as this. Hence you must abandon this ground as untenable, and to be consistent, you must either maintain that one of

these actions alone is baptism, or that all of them combined are baptism; or that each one of these different things is baptism.

Ped baptist.—Well, my friend, if I cannot sustain the position that pouring, sprinkling, and immersion are different modes of baptism, then I will take the ground that each of these several things is baptism.

Baptist.—Then you maintain that each of the several different, and specific actions of pouring, sprinkling, immersion, etc., is one and the same thing. Let us examine this position. That immersion is baptism is granted by all the world. Now, if sprinkling is baptism, and pouring is baptism, then it follows that sprinkling is immersion, and pouring is immersion, and so *vice versa*. For according to a celebrated axiom, *things that are equal to the same thing, are equal to one another.*

Ped baptist.—My dear brother, as I discover no discrepancy or error in your argument, I shall not attempt to refute it; but will proceed to urge an argument in favor of infant and adult sprinkling, on which the Pedobaptists place great reliance. This, by the way, would have been presented in its proper place, had it not escaped my recollection.

Circumcision, I presume you are aware, was the *seal* of the Abrahamic Covenant under the former economy. Hence all the male children or descendants of the believing Patriarch, received this seal or mark, and were admitted to the blessings and benefits of that covenant. So in the church, under the Gospel dispensation, which is a continuation of the Jewish church, baptism is to be regarded as a seal of the new covenant i. e. New Testament blessings, and should therefore be applied to the children of believers.—Again, as baptism is a seal, we might raise an argument from analogy in favor of sprinkling or pouring. In sealing a letter, the wax is applied to only a small part. Hence in baptism the water should be applied to only a small part, and there is no more propriety in dipping a man in water, than there is in dipping a letter in sealing wax.

Baptist—The position you have taken here for granted, that the Gospel dispensation of grace is a continuation of the Jewish, is wholly assumed, and cannot be proved. We have shown that baptism did not come in the room of circumcision; it follows of course, that it must belong to a new and distinct dispensation. Many Pedobaptists affirm that circumcision and baptism are seals of the covenant of grace; but the truth is, the Scriptures no where teach us that either the one or the other is the seal of any covenant. But they teach us that the *sign* or *mark* of circumcision which Abraham received, was to him a seal of the righteousness of that faith, *which he had before he was circumcised*.* Now, the object of this appears to have been, to show that he was to be the spiritual father of all those that believe, and of no others, whether circumcised or not. Hence circumcision could not have been a seal of righteousness to his descendants, for they were circumcised in their infancy. Again this is the only place in the Bible, where circumcision is called a sign or seal of righteousness, and it was that to Abraham and to no one else.

*Rom. II.

To affirm that baptism is a seal of New Testament blessings, is an unwarranted assumption which, in the absence of proof, cannot be admitted; for in the whole New Testament account of baptism, there is not an intimation, a hint, or even any allusion made by our Lord, or his disciples, about baptism's being a seal. Still the Scriptures are not silent respecting the seal. The children of God "are sealed unto the day of Redemption," Eph. 4: 30; and they are "sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise," Eph. 1: 13, yet not in a state of infancy *before* they believed, but *afterwards*. This seal impresses the child of God with a marked, permanent character, which is the true circumcision of the heart, "in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh."

It appears to me very absurd indeed, to call infant baptism a seal; for if it can be so called, it must be a seal for the ratification of a nonentity. Nothing surely is sealed, unless the act of baptism regenerates the child, as is intimated by the baptismal service in the Liturgy of the Episcopal Church. If it does that, it might with propriety be styled a seal of character, and the evidence of title to spiritual blessings. But if no inward spiritual grace be imparted to the soul of infants by this rite, how can it be a sealing ordinance. Now Calvin, who regarded *baptism as the appendage and seal of faith*, "and, therefore, posterior in order," very wisely remarks that "if it be administered without faith, it is both an injurious and gross profanation." (*Com. in Act. 1: 36.*)

As it regards the argument in favor of sprinkling, drawn from the analogy of sealing a letter; we need only say that the Bible nowhere represents baptism as a seal. Hence this argument falls to the ground. And in addition to this, we would remark that even analogy is against it. A seal is a mark or impression. Hence circumcision may with propriety be termed a seal. But as baptism makes no external or internal mark or impression, (read Acts, 8: 13—24,) it cannot with any propriety be termed a seal.

Pedobaptist.—Whether infant baptism be a seal or not, Pedobaptists believe that very much is accomplished by it. Experience, they say, has shown that the greater number of those, that become the subjects of divine grace, and unite with the church, were baptized in infancy. Hence, they infer that God blesses this rite, therefore, it should be observed.

Baptist.—My friend, we think under the blessing of God, that these persons' conversion is to be imputed, not to their infant baptism, but to their religious education, for the Bible teaches us that men are "sanctified through the truth." John 17: 17, 19. 14: 6. Acts, 4: 12. Rom. 10: 9, 14, 17. This view of the subject is confirmed by the fact, that experience has shown that the greater number of those who join our churches, were neither baptized nor rantized in infancy, but, nevertheless, had pious parents, and received religious instructions and moral training. Now on this religious cultivation watered with devout prayer, God has promised to shed the glorious beams of his heavenly grace. But the idea that the mere external rite of rantism does, in some mysterious manner, shed upon the infant heart the holy influences of Christianity, is absurd. And the

annals of the church show conclusively that those churches, which do not practise this unauthorized rite, are blessed with as great accessions and as much spiritual prosperity, when they use the divinely appointed means,* as those which do practise it.

Pedobaptist.—As I have no testimony on hand to invalidate your argument, I will pass on to John's Baptism. To which dispensation do you assign *that*, to the Jewish, or Christian? Do you believe that John's Baptism is Christian Baptism?

Baptist --I regret that our time will not allow me to go into a thorough examination of this subject; but it is not necessary, as it cannot materially affect the argument of baptism, whether John's baptism be assigned to the Jewish or Christian dispensation. The argument derived from it in favor of immersion, remains in either case substantially the same.

We have shown, by the highest Pedobaptist authority, that the whole church practised immersion for 1300 years. Can it be shown that during this whole period, John's baptism or Ministry was ever called in question, as not belonging to the Christian or Gospel dispensation?

Pedobaptist.—As John's baptism was instituted, prior to the abrogation of the law by the death of Christ, (which act introduced the Christian dispensation,) therefore it must belong to the Jewish, instead of the Gospel economy.

Baptist.—My friend, it is evident that the institutions of the Gospel, must have been given prior to Christ's death or they could not have been sealed by his blood. In the law, you know, Moses first gave the precepts, then he sprinkled the book with the blood of the testament; in like manner in the Gospel, the two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, were instituted prior to the death of Christ, that they might be sealed with the blood of the New Testament. Again, if the hypothesis be adopted that the Christian dispensation did not commence till the death of Christ, it throws the Lord's Supper (which was instituted before his death) back into the old dispensation, and annihilates it, as a Christian ordinance, and vetoes the baptism performed under the direct authority and immediate notice of Christ. John, 3: 22, 26. 4: 1, 2. Now as Christ authorized his disciples to baptize before he gave his final commission, and as John's baptism and theirs appears to have been confined to the Jews, Matt. 10: 5, 6, therefore the commission seems not to have been the origin, but a renewal and an extension of the command so as to embrace all nations.

Pedobaptist.—But, my brother, John did not baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, which is peculiar to the Gospel dispensation.

Baptist.—How do you know that he did not baptize in the name of the Trinity? Have you any evidence in the Bible to sustain this position? When John told "the people that they should believe on Him that should come after him," he was undoubtedly preaching. Now, that John re-

* As an illustration of this fact, we need only point to the present flourishing condition of the Baptist denomination in the United States, numbering over 6000 churches.

ceived his commission from God to baptize, there can be no doubt, and as the formula used by him, is not recorded, the precise terms in which it was couched are not known; therefore we have no proof that he did not baptize in the name of the Trinity.

Pedobaptist.—But if John baptized in the name of the Trinity, is it not ineffably absurd to suppose that in the account of this religious ceremony, so essential a feature should be omitted?

Baptist.—No more absurd, my brother, than that the same omission should occur in the record of the Apostles' baptism.

Pedobaptist.—Have we any evidence that the Apostles baptized in the name of the Trinity; and if so, what is that evidence?

Baptist.—Christ has made the doing of whatsoever he commands a test of friendship to him. And as the commission which the Apostles received, required them to baptize in the name of the Trinity, we conclude that they could not have been his friends and disciples, and still refuses to obey their commission by forsaking the formula which it enjoined.

Pedobaptist.—It is said, Acts 10: 48. 8: 16, that they were baptized "in the name of the Lord Jesus."* Now if this be the case how could they have been baptized in the name of the Trinity?

Baptist.—Now, my friend, to baptize in the name of Jesus, we think implies that it was done "by his authority, with his baptism, and unto his religion; (making express mention of the three persons of the Trinity,) as he had clearly commanded in Matthew." (See Robinson's Catechism, Art. Baptism.)

Pedobaptist.—My dear brother, as you have given us your reasons for not assigning John's baptism to the Jewish dispensation, it would be gratifying to me now to hear you present some of your more prominent reasons, for believing that John's baptism is Gospel baptism.

Baptist.—1. It is evident that John's baptism did not belong to the Jewish economy, for if it had, he would not have refused to baptize the Pharisees and Sadducees, who were of the seed of Abraham, because they brought forth no "fruits meet for repentance." The various ablutions and sprinklings among the Jews, were generally performed before entering on an office, or after some pollution, and even then without requiring any evidences of repentance.

2. Had John's baptism been contained in the Law of Moses, the Pharisees would have known it; and the question our Savior put to them, "The baptism of John whence is it, from heaven, or of man?" They, without any hesitation, would have answered from heaven, instead of saying "we cannot tell," because Moses received the law from heaven.

3. If John's baptism differed materially from Gospel baptism, it would seem that our Savior, when commissioning his disciples, would have pointed out that difference.

4. The positive declarations of Scripture prove that it belongs to the New Testament economy

God declares by his prophet Daniel that in those days he will "set up a kingdom," Dan. 2: 44, not one that has already been set up. Now that this kingdom, spoken of by Daniel, i. e. the Gospel dispensation of grace commenced with the preaching of John the Baptist, is as certain as the

* It was the opinion of many of the fathers and some councils that the Apostles sometimes baptized in the name of Jesus only, Ambrose affirms "that though one person only of the Trinity were expressed, the baptism is perfect. For," adds he, "whosoever names one person of the Trinity means the whole."

declarations of Scripture can make it. "The law and the prophet," says our Savior, "were until John, since that time the Kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." Luke 16: 16. See also Luke 17: 21; Matt. 21: 31, 32.—Mark recognizes the ministry of John, as belonging to the Gospel dispensation. "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God," Mark 1: 1. SCOTT, in his notes on this passage, says: This was in fact the beginning of the Gospel, the introduction of the New Testament dispensation, etc. Dr. WHITNEY says: "The history of John the Baptist, is styled the *beginning of the Gospel*, because he began his office by preaching *repentance*, as the preparation to receive it and faith in the Messiah as the subject of it." MATTHEW HENRY, (in loco:) "The Gospel began in John the Baptist. Peter begins from the baptism of John. Acts 1: 22. "In John's preaching and *ordinances*," &c., "there was the beginning of the *Gospel* [church.— See also Dr. PRIDEAUX'S explanation of Daniel's prophecy of the *seven weeks*. Conlect. 2, pp. 53, 54. Dr. KNAPP, the learned Lutheran divine and Prof. of Theology, in the University of Halle, says: "If we regard the authority of Christ and his disciples, we must confess that the baptism of each [i. e. of Jesus and John] was *one and the same institute* of God himself; and that the design of each in administering it was one, inasmuch as it had the same looking to the repentance of the candidates and their faith in Christ, whether about to come or having come already." John 1: 31. 3: 27; Matt. 11: 12; Mark 1: 4; Luke 3: 3; Acts 19: 4." Dr. W. C. BROWNLEE of New York regards "the baptism of John and of Christ" the same in their divine *origin*, the same in element, [water] the same in the doctrine of faith and repentance, Luke 3: 3, the one baptism, Eph. 4: 5." See his work on the principles of Quakers, pp. 225. With this agrees the testimony of Calvin, (Calvin's Inst., B. 4, c. 15.)—Again, our Savior during John's imprisonment, designates the ministry of John the Baptist as the beginning of the Gospel dispensation, and places the matter beyond all contradiction, by saying: "From the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence." But on the supposition that John's baptism was not Christian baptism, and that the Gospel dispensation did not commence till after Christ's death, all of John's and Christ's disciples, the twelve apostles, etc., must have been re-baptized, either on the day of Pentecost, or subsequently, before they could be admitted to the privileges of the Christian church;—a supposition too absurd to be admitted for a moment." Where, I would ask, is there to be found on the sacred record an instance of such a repetition of baptism?

Pedobaptist.—I am happy to inform you, that just such an instance is recorded in the 19th chapter of the Acts, where Paul re-baptized 12 of John's disciples.

Baptist.—That these persons were re-baptized by Paul is not certain. It must be admitted that great and good divines are divided in opinion on this subject. Let us now quote and examine this passage as recorded by Luke the historian. 1. "And it came to pass, that, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus: And finding certain disciples, 2 He said unto them, have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. 3. And he said unto them unto what then were ye baptized? And they said unto John's baptism. 4. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus; and when they heard it,

they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.* And when Paul had laid his hands on them the Holy Ghost came on them and they spake with tongues and prophesied." (Acts 19: 1-6.) Now the decision of this question depends entirely upon the interpretation given of the words contained in the fifth verse. "When they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." These words are understood by one party as the language of Paul, and by the other of Luke the historian. We regard this as a part of Paul's description of the nature and design of John's baptism. Our opponents contend that it is the language of Luke the historian. This last interpretation it will be seen refers the language of the fifth verse to the twelve disciples instead of to the people mentioned in the fourth verse. Now if this interpretation is true, then these disciples must have been re-baptized in consequence of what Paul said to them in the fourth verse. But what, I ask, is there in Paul's language calculated to convince them of the invalidity of their baptism? He who can discover any thing must possess a keener vision than we can boast. Now this we deem an insuperable objection to this interpretation.— And again, if there were any particular difference in the baptism of John and Christ, it would seem that Paul on this occasion was imperiously called upon to point it out. Once more, you will observe here that it is not said that Paul baptized these disciples but that he laid his hands on them. Finally, we are not alone in our views on this passage, for it is the opinion of Calvin, Beza, Pool, Robins and a host of Pedobaptist divines, that these disciples were not re-baptized. It is also worthy of remark, that the view we have taken of the baptism of these disciples, is confirmed by the case of Apollos. "This man was instructed in the way of the Lord; and, being fervent in the Spirit he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John."— When Priscilla and Aquila met with him, they only expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly; as we learn from Acts 18: 25, 26. It is evident from this case, in connexion with the fact that there is no account, so far as we can learn from Scripture, of any one of the followers of Christ, who were baptized by John or the Apostles, prior to the giving of the final commission, that was afterwards re-baptized. Hence we conclude that John's baptism was essentially Christian baptism; and all that could afterwards be necessary, was to teach them the way of the Lord more perfectly.

But, were we to admit the interpretation that these disciples were re-baptized, it is altogether probable as the transaction occurred more than twenty years after John's death, and as these disciples "resided nearly a thousand miles from the scene of John's labors," that they were baptized by some one of John's disciples, who had failed to direct them to Christ, and to give them all of the instruction which John was accustomed to communicate.† Admitting such to have been the circumstances, which are altogether probable, (if this interpretation be true,) this passage does not militate at all against the validity of John's baptism,‡ nor prove that it is not to all intents and purposes Christian baptism. The *Penny Cyclopædia* says: "The meaning of Christian baptism differed, little, if at all, from the baptism of John."

* Literally, "And hearing it (a kousames de) they were baptized," etc.

† John taught his hearers that there was a Holy Ghost. Matt. 3: 11. And yet these disciples had not so much as heard of any Holy Ghost.— Hence we conclude that they could not have been baptized by John.

‡ See American Bap. Magazine for the year 1825, pp. 374. Knappii Scripta varii argumenti, etc. Vol. 1. p. 163-4.

Pedobaptist.—My friend,*as the most prominent arguments have been urged against the idea that John's baptism is 'Christian baptism. And as this view of the subject cannot materially affect the argument in favor of immersion, I will waive it, and present an objection against the Baptist idea, that John's baptism was immersion; which is thought by many Pedobaptists as unanswerable. "It is said that 'Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, went out and were baptized of him in Jordan.' Now according to Josephus, there were from eight to ten millions of people in these countries. Now suppose John . . . could endure the fatigue to work 8 hours in the day, and baptize *one person a minute*, it would take him from 45 to 56 years, to dip all these multitudes." or if only *half* that number it would take him half that time. If "one quarter part as many, it would take him from 11 to 14 years. In fact, it would take him more than five years to dip one million; and John's head was cut off in about eighteen months—*great part* of which time he spent in prison. Yet the Scriptures do say *positively*, that *all* the people in *all* these countries were actually baptized of John in Jordan. When the Scriptures say all, they certainly mean at least the larger part."

"Now it is as plain as day, that John could no more baptize all these people by *dipping*, than he could lift the world, or put out the sun!!! It is a palpable absurdity to suppose it."

But "he could take the water from Jordan, and *sprinkle* thousands and thousands in a day. This was undoubtedly the way he baptized."—{*Scripture Directory to Baptism*, pp. 13, 14.}

Baptist.—"This argument, my friend, so specious and plausible, is frequently advanced with such an air of confidence and triumph, as almost to silence the opponent whom it fails to convince. It is nevertheless founded in a misapprehension" of the import of language and is therefore perfectly fallacious. It proceeds upon the assumption, that *rantism* is *baptism*; i. e. that sprinkling is immersion; (which we have shown could not be the case,) and that the word *all* here means the larger part; and, consequently, that John baptized in less than 9 months, to say the least, the larger part of all the individuals, comprised in the whole realm of Israel. Now we have no doubt, that we shall be enabled to show, that John baptized a much less number, than you seem disposed to make out. It is true, it is said, there "went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." But it is plain from many passages, that this was a very common and popular style of expression, by which the word *all* imports a *great many*. (See Phil. 2: 21. John 4: 25, 29.) We are expressly told, John 3: 26, that they said to John "Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan to whom thou bearest witness, behold the same baptizeth, and *all men* come unto him." Now, if the word *all* in these passages is to be taken in its widest sense, then John baptized *all Judea, Jerusalem, etc.*, and Jesus Christ baptized *all men*; and consequently re-baptized all of John's disciples. But did Christ re-baptize John's disciples? "If he did not, then the people were not *all* baptized of John" nor of Christ.—Again, a similar mode of expression occurs in Luke 3: 21. "Now when *all* the people were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heavens were opened," etc. But we are informed that "after those things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea, and *there* he tarried with them and baptized. And John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was *much water* there:—and they came and were baptized." "If John had previously baptized *ALL* the people, then both he and the disciples of Christ who still continued to baptize, must be considered *Ana-baptists!*" (i. e. those who re-baptize.)

Again, if we were to admit that John baptized the "larger part" of the people of Israel, then Jesus and his disciples must have re-baptized many, that John baptized; or else it could not have been true "that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John." (Though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples.) *Matthew Henry*, (in loco.) "He," Christ, "made and baptized more disciples than John; not only more than John did at this time, but at any time," and yet he says "it is computed that Christ staid in Judea about six months."

2. In regard to John's ministry continuing only 18 months, I think your computation very erroneous; some suppose that it commenced, A. D., 26; others in 27 and others still in 28. But according to the learned bishop Prideaux it continued three years and a half. This being the case he had more time than 9 months in which to baptize. Now, if Jesus baptized, in about six months, more disciples than John, in the course of three years, we must conclude that John never baptized, or even baptized such immense multitudes as our opponents imagine.

3. It is evident from Scripture, that John was very cautious in the reception of disciples, for he not only preached *repentance* to the people, but required of the Pharisees and Sadducees "fruits of repentance." And we are informed by Luke, 3: 7, 8, that John made this same demand of "the multitude that came forth to be baptized of him." Now, as all the persons whom John baptized *confessed their sins*, it is probable, that multitudes came to his baptism, to whom this rite was never administered.—Hence, it is obvious, from the whole account of John's baptism, that those whom he baptized, gave evidence that they believed his messages; and openly professed repentance towards God and faith in the approaching Messiah. Thus the following Pedobaptist divines

Dr. ERSKINE. "John's baptism was termed the *baptism of repentance*, and baptism *to repentance*; because he required of all, whom he admitted to baptism, a profession of repentance, and exhorted them to such a conduct as would demonstrate their repentance genuine."

SCOTT. "It does not appear that any but adults were baptized by John. . . . Adult Jews, professing repentance and a disposition to become the Messiah's subjects were the *only persons* whom John admitted to baptism." (Coin. Matt. 3: 5, 6.) BURKITT. John's baptism was the baptism of which infants were incapable. Notes on Matt. 19: 13-15.

Now, if John was thus cautious in the reception of disciples, and did not baptize any, till he could gain evidence of their repentance and faith in the Messiah, it is evident that he could not have baptized such vast multitudes as many Pedobaptists suppose. Again, it is probable that he could have immersed them, as fast as he obtained evidence of their personal faith.*

* GERMAN TESTAMENT; Matt. 3: 1, "In those days came *Johannes Der Tauffer*;" John the dipper.—THE DUTCH TESTAMENT; "In those days came *Johannes En Dooper*;" John the dipper. Again on Matt. 3: 5, 6: "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, &c., and were *gedoopt in de Jourduen*;" and were dipped in the Jordan.—Acts, 8: 8; "and they went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and *hy doopte hem*;" and he dipped him, etc. CONFESSION OF HELVETIA (drawn up by the direction of Bucer in 1536, ten years before the death of Luther) says: "Baptism was instituted and consecrated by God: and the first baptized was John who *dipped* Christ in the water of Jordan."—MAGDEBURG CENTURIATORS. "The Son of God was *dipped* in the water of Jordan, by the hand of John the Baptist."—*In Pedobap. Exam.* LIGHTFOOT AND ADAM CLARK. "That the baptism of John was by *plunging* the body

4. It is an undoubted fact, that John could *immerse* in a decent manner a thousand adults, in as short a time as he could *sprinkle*, in a decent manner, these same adults and their children.

5. Finally, (though Jesus baptized more disciples than John,) it must be admitted, if there is any truth in Scripture, that the great mass of the Jewish people still adhered to the *Scribes and Pharisees, who rejected the counsel of God against themselves*, and were not baptized either by John or Christ.—John informs us that Christ “*came w/o his own,*” “*To the Jewish nation to whom he had been so expressly promised,*” etc.—Doddridge. “*And his own received him not.*” The great mass of the people; the Scribes and Pharisees rejected him. A few in his life time received him, and many more after his death.”—Barnes in loco. “*The generality rejected Him*” . . . Yet there was a remnant that *owned* him. Rom. 11: 7.—Henry in loco. “*Israel hat'n not obtained,*” i. e. “*the nation at large hath not obtained salvation.*”—Dr. Patton. See Rom. 9: 27, 31, 32, . 10, 21, etc. Now from the whole tenor of these passages, “*it is palpably absurd to suppose*” that John baptized more than a mere remnant of these people.

P. debrist.—My brother, I am constrained to admit, that you have, in your reply, completely demolished the assumed foundation, on which my objection or argument was based, viz: that the word *all* must mean the greater part. Hence the argument falls and cannot therefore militate against the idea, that John's baptism was, necessarily, any thing other than immersion. I will therefore waive this subject, and proceed to notice the baptism of our Savior. It seems to be a prime, and prominent argument with your denomination, that it is the duty of all Christians to imitate the example of Christ in baptism, by going down into the water and being immersed. Now I conceive this to be a great mistake, which will appear evident if we take into view the object of Christ's baptism. “*When Christ was about to enter upon the public ministry of the priesthood, he applied for baptism to a priest under the Jewish law, in order to fulfil all righteousness, and thus to render obedience to the ceremonial law,*” as found in Num. 8: 6, 7, and Ex. 30: 49, 20.” Hence, it is evident that “*Christ's baptism was designed regularly to introduce him into his priestly office, according to the law of Moses, under which he commenced his ministry, and which it behoved him to fulfil.*” Now would it be consistent for us to go down into the water, under the idea of following Christ into his priestly office? In view of these facts, is “*the baptism of Jesus Christ to be imitated by Christians?*”

Baptist.—You have assumed as fact here, what cannot be proved, and must not therefore be conceded, viz: that Christ applied to a priest under the Law, for baptism. It is true that Christ applied to John for baptism,

(after the same manner as the washing the unclean persons was) seems to appear from those things which are related of him; namely, that he *baptized in Jrdn*, that he baptized in *Enn*, because there was much water there,” &c. (In *A. Clark's Commentary*, at the end of Mark.) ORIGIN remarks “*that the four Evangelists say, that John confessed he came to baptize in water,*” etc. Dr. J. J. GURNEY, a distinguished Friend, states that—“*the baptism practised by John and by the Apostles*” was an “*IMMERSION in water.*”—*Observ. on the Pecul. of Fr'ends.* pp. 61. MOSHEIM testifies substantially to the same fact.—*Eccl. Hist. Cent. 1., Part 1.* See Campbell's Translation of the four Gospels, Matt. 3: 16. Also Doddridge, in loco. Macknight's Apostol. Epis. Note on Rom. 6: 4. Many others might be adduced but this will suffice.

but where is there any evidence on record, that John was ever consecrated a priest? Had that been the case, would he not have been known to the Jewish Priesthood; and would they have sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to demand of him who he was; and would he have answered them as he did? "To prove that Christ was baptized to fulfil an existing law of Moses," you refer us to Ex. 30: 19—21, "which every biblical scholar knows to refer not at all to the consecration of a priest to the sacerdotal office, but merely to a ceremony to be performed when the priest entered the tabernacle to offer sacrifice." Again for the manner in which this is performed you have referred us to Num. 8: 6, 7. But if you will examine this passage, you will find that it "does not relate to the priests but to the Levites alone." It would seem that every man acquainted with Jewish Antiquities, would know that there exists a marked "distinction between the ceremonies for consecrating a priest, and those for consecrating a Levite."

"Again: No Jewish priest was ever consecrated by baptism merely.—(See Ex. 29) Lundius, the standard critical writer on the sacred antiquities of the Jews, teaches that 'sacrifice was the chief part' of the consecration; and that washing was only preparatory and subordinate. All Hebrew antiquities agree in saying that the consecration of the priests consisted of four parts: 1. washing; 2. putting on sacerdotal robes; 3. unction; 4. sacrifice. Can, then, any of these acts alone constitute a sacerdotal consecration? Furthermore, all these rites must be performed *in the tabernacle*, or temple, must *continue seven days*, and candidates must not *leave the tabernacle*, but must repeat *all those rites seven times*, that is, each of the seven days. We cannot stop to prove these statements for they are not disputed points among the learned. For the honor of theological science among us, we sincerely hope that we shall never again be told, that baptism in the Jordan, away from the temple, without the robes of office, without a Jewish unction, without any sacrifice, without a sevenfold repetition lasting seven days, is a consecration to the sacerdotal office *as required by the law of Moses.*"

"So far from such a consecration being *required* of Christ by the ceremonial law, it would be a direct *violation* of that law. No one *could* be a priest, unless he was a descendant of Aaron in the male line. The Mishna, and all the critical writers on this subject, show that a critical examination was to be made of the lineage of each priest, and that his descent could not be taken for granted, upon mere declaration, but must be demonstrated from family registers: see Ezra 6: 62, and Nehem. 7: 64." Now Christ did not belong to that line of descendants, who alone could become priests, but was of the tribe of Judah, 'of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood.' Heb. 7: 14.—Christian Review, Vol. 3.

It will not be pretended, that this was the ground of John's scruples in baptizing him, for the Gospels tell us, that his scruples were of an entirely different nature." And, since it is evident that John himself was never constituted a priest, nothing can be more absurd than to suppose that he administered the rite of baptism to Christ, to introduce him into his priestly office according to the law of Moses; when they both must have known by that very law, that Christ could not, on pain of death, approach that sacred office. Num. 3: 10 and 1: 51. But Paul says: (Heb. 7.) "Christ is a priest after the order Melchisedec and not after the order of Aaron." And where is the evidence that Melchisedec was initiated into the priestly office by baptism.—The apostle proceeds (v. 12,) "For the priesthood being changed, there was made of necessity a change also of the law."—Hence, Christ was not "made [or constituted] a priest after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." (v. 16.) It

is surprising that Pedobaptist ministers, standing in the sacred desk, with the Bible in their hands, will make such unfounded statements as we have heard on this subject.

Is it a fact, that Jesus Christ in his baptism is not an example for us to follow? In primitive times, Christ required his disciples to follow him. And it is said that "they forsook all and followed him." The apostles affirm positively that "they received from the Lord what they delivered to the Churches"—I Cor. 11: 23. 15: 3. They commended those that "kept the ordinances as they were delivered" and exhorted all to be followers of them, as they were of Christ.—I Cor. 11: 1, 2. 4: 16, 17.—Phil. 3: 17. Col 2: 5, 8, 11. 2 Thes. 2: 15.—The Baptists desire to share in the felicity of those of whom it will one day be said, "These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth."

Pedobaptist.—My friend, the objection urged against the propriety of imitating the example of Christ in baptism, which you have just answered, was presented, not because I considered it a valid one, but because my Pedobaptist brethren usually deemed it such.—I will now present another argument, on which they place great stress. Water baptism is a symbol of spiritual baptism. This being the case, is it not evident, that the mode of water baptism should correspond to the mode of spiritual baptism?—Now, it is a fact, that throughout the Bible, the mode of spiritual baptism is represented under the figure of pouring out. Hence, baptism must be pouring.—The baptism of the Holy Ghost was also performed by pouring.—Again the baptism of the Israelites "in the cloud and in the sea" (I Cor. 10: 1, 2.) was pouring, for the Psalmist in giving an account of this baptism says, "the clouds poured out water."—Psalm. 77: 16-20.

Baptist.—My brother, this is a very specious theory but is it true that baptism is pouring, because the Holy Spirit is said to be *poured out*? If so it ought by no means to be rejected. Unfortunately, if this position taken by you, Pedobaptists, be admitted, it proves too much, for without any ceremony, it turns out of your churches as defective, sprinkling, immersion, etc., and virtually condemns the baptism practised by the Christian world for thirteen centuries, if we except the baptism affusion of *Novatian* and other *clinics*, respecting the validity of whose baptism there was so much contention in the Church.

I am aware, my friend, that many Pedobaptists suppose that the baptism of the Holy Spirit is emblematical of Christian baptism; but this position we think cannot be sustained by the Bible, for the spirit of inspiration never once attempts to explain or represent *natural things* by presenting *spiritual*, but contrarywise, he not unfrequently explains or represents the *effects* of spiritual things by an exhibition of natural things, and their effects.

Again, it is the opinion of many, that regeneration by the Spirit's influences, is the baptism of the Holy Spirit. But regeneration is never called in the Scriptures by this name. Hence it is evident that the baptism of the Holy Spirit must be a different and distinct thing from regeneration. It is also evident, that there has been nothing that the Oracles of truth call "the baptism of the Holy Spirit" since the day of Pentecost or at least the Apostolic age. Hence, we infer, and confidently believe, that this bap-

* It is notorious in history, that from the days of Paul, Rom. 6: 4.—down to the fifteenth century, comparatively the whole Christian world regarded it their duty to imitate the example of Christ in baptism.

tism was confined to the age of miracles; and that there is no baptism of the Holy Spirit in these days. Those who affirm that there is, we call upon to prove it.*

"The baptism of the Holy Spirit is a figurative expression, and explicable on the principle of immersion." Now it must be obvious to every one, that the literal sense of a word must control its figurative application; and we have ascertained the literal meaning of baptism to be immersion, and that too, by the most learned jury, we could empanel from the Pedobaptist world. No man in the first 15 or 16 centuries, ever dreamed or suspected that this Greek word had any other meaning; and even the Greeks at this present day remain ignorant of it. Hence the baptism of the Spirit, must have reference to IMMERSION, because that is the literal meaning of the word.

Finally, my friend, the idea that the baptism of the Israelites was pouring, because the Psalmist says the clouds poured out water, is palpably absurd. For *the clouds* which the Psalmist mentions could not have been the cloud which Paul says the Israelites were baptized into, in connection with the Sea. Now to suppose that this cloud poured out or sprinkled water upon the Israelites, is to suppose what cannot be true; for in that case, they could not have gone on dry ground through the midst of the sea.—(See Ex. 14: 16, 22, 29.) Again they could not have been sprinkled from the spray of the sea for the waters were congealed. Ex. 15: 8.—Prof. Stuart, pp. 336, says: "The suggestion has sometimes been made that the Israelites were sprinkled by the cloud and by the sea; and this was the baptism which Paul meant to designate. But the cloud on this occasion was not a cloud of rain; nor do we find any intimation that the waters of the Red Sea sprinkled the children of Israel at this time." And it is evident from the whole account that no water touched them. Hence we conclude that this was a *figurative* baptism. And we cannot conceive

* JOHN predicted that Christ "should baptize (*en*) in the Holy Ghost and Fire." Now it is obvious from the account given of this baptism in Acts 2: 2, 3, 4, that there was no literal sprinkling or pouring out of the *Holy Ghost and Fire* upon the people. The figure evidently refers to an *immersion* as it represents the abundance of the gifts and influences of the Spirit. We, in like manner, use the word *immerse*. When a man has an abundance of business on hand we say *he is immersed in business*. *Baptizo* as clearly implies immersion in this passage as in any other. In precisely this sense did the Greek fathers understand it; and they certainly could not have mistaken its literal import. THEOPHYLACT, in his exposition of this passage, Matt. 3: 11, says: "That is, he shall inundate you, *toutesti kataklusei umas*, abundantly with the gifts of the Spirit. CYRIL, (who was for twenty years pastor of the church at Jerusalem) about A. D. 371, Cateches. 17: 8, says: "For as he that goes down into the water and is baptized, is surrounded on all sides by the water, so the apostles were totally baptized (immersed) by the Spirit. The water surrounds the body externally, but the Spirit incomprehensibly baptizes (immerses) the soul within." Even some modern Pedobaptists who practise sprinkling understand it in this sense. ABP. TILLOTSON: "*U* [the sound from heaven, Acts 2: 2.] *filled all the house*. This is that which our Savior calls *baptizing with the Holy Ghost*. So that they who sat in the house were, as it were, immersed in the Holy Ghost, as they who were buried with water, were overwhelmed and covered all over with water, which is the *proper* notion of baptism." So CASABON, and others.

that it can be explained on any other principle than that it has a reference to immersion.*

Pedobaptist.—Why is the Spirit said to be poured out upon men, if the pouring out of water does not resemble it?

Baptist.—The Spirit is said to be poured out not because there is any actual pouring, which is represented by pouring out water in baptism; but from the resemblance between the effects of water poured upon certain objects, and the influence or operations of the Spirit. When water is poured out upon vegetables it causes them to grow and flourish. So when God communicates of his spirit to men "it causes them to spring up as willows by the water courses"—"to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, Isa. 41: 3, 4. Mal. 3: 10, 11, 12. Here the effects of the one resemble the effects of the other. Again our Savior compares the effects of the spirit, to the effects produced by the wind, John 3: 8. But do you suppose, my brother, that we can represent the mode of the Spirit's operations by baptism? If this could be done, the Spirit must be literally poured out; and if the Spirit is literally poured out, then it follows as a consequence that God must be material. Hence it is obvious that this whole theory is founded upon the absurd hypothesis that God is a material being—for we can form no conception how an immaterial Omnipresent Spirit can be poured out upon man. Out of what can he be poured? Surely out of nothing. Hence on the admission that God is immaterial, it is evident that this theory has nothing better to rest upon than "the baseless fabric of a vision." Now it is generally admitted that God is an immaterial spirit. Who then can comprehend the mode of His existence, or the mode of His operations? We can neither comprehend the existence, nor operations of our own spirit, much less that of the Eternal Spirit. Hence, no one can know the mode of the Spirit's operations, for from the nature of the subject, it infinitely transcends the conceptions of all finite minds. Hence the ineffable absurdity of attempting to symbolize or represent the Spirit's operations by water baptism.

Suppose, however, we were to carry out this theory of Pedobaptists, viz: that the mode of the Spirit's operations, or rather that the words used to designate its conveyance or communication, is designed to teach us the mode of water baptism. Then we should have modes of baptism in abundance; because the communication of the spirit is indicated by

* ARCHBISHOP NEWCOMB says, "They," the Israelites, "were figuratively and typically baptized; they were led to acknowledge the divine mission of Moses through these miracles expressive of baptism." BLOOMFIELD adds, "The material of the cloud and sea, being nothing but water, was well adapted to express this typical representation of baptism." And PROF. STUART admits that it has "reference to the idea of surrounding."

WIRSIUS, in his exposition, inquires "How were the Israelites baptized IN THE CLOUD, and IN THE SEA, seeing they were neither immersed in the sea, nor wetted by the cloud?" and replies, "It is to be considered, that the apostle here uses the term 'baptism' in a figurative sense; yet there is some agreement to the external sign. The sea is water, and a cloud differs but little from water. The cloud hung over their heads, and the sea surrounded them on each side; and so the water in regard to those that are baptized." And DR. WHITEY adds: "Their going into the sea resembled the ancient rite of going into the water; and their coming out of it, the rising up out of it." The same view of this passage is substantially entertained by the learned GROTIUS, PROF. VENEMA, DR. HAMMOND, POOL'S CONTINUATORS, GATAKER, TURRETINUS, and many others, all Pedobaptists.

many other words besides *pouring*. Among which we name the following.

"Extend," Isa. 66: 12. { "Breath on," John 20: 22. { "Fell on," Acts 8: 44.
 "Sitting," Acts 2: 3. { "Came," Acts 2: 2. { "Giving," do 15: 8.
 "Send upon," L. 24: 49 { "Shed forth," Acts 2: 23. { "Sealing," Eph. 1: 13

Now if the mode of baptism should be pouring because the Spirit is said to be poured out, then extending should be another mode for the same reason; 2 modes. Sitting, another; 3 modes. Sending upon, another; 4 modes. Breathing on, 5. Coming, 6. Shedding forth, 7.—Falling on, 8. Giving, 9. Sealing, 10. Now, how can water baptism represent each of these 10 modes? How can it represent breathing, sitting, etc. It is evident from these passages, that God intends to inform us that there is an actual communication of the Spirit; and not the mode of that Spirit's operations or conveyance. For these things cannot be symbolized by natural things. "There is no likeness to a Spirit, nor to the mode of his operations. It would be as easy to make a likeness of God creating the world, and attempt to represent by a picture the divine operations, in the formation of matter, as to represent by symbols the manner of the communication of the Holy Spirit, and his operations on the soul. If Christians were not infatuated with the desire of establishing a favorite system, so gross conceptions of God could not have so long escaped detection."

Again, my friend, Pedobaptists "confound things that are different." Water is *poured* into a bath or vessel for the purpose of immersing the feet or body but the *immersion* is not the *pouring*. Again if baptism should be by pouring, why do not Pedobaptist ministers say *I pour thee in the name*, etc. But can persons be poured like liquids? Finally, if pouring be baptism why did not the Holy Spirit use the word *cheo* or *echeo* which is expressive of that action.

Pedobaptists.—My dear brother, if baptism means pouring, sprinkling, etc., what benefit would result from using the terms you mention? But what pleases you?

Baptist—Why to hear you say *if* it means thus and so, when you know very well that it means no such thing. I presume you are aware, that it is a general law in language, that if we substitute the actual meaning of a word for the word, that it will make good sense. For example.

The people *congregate* at half past 10 o'clock, the sermon *commences* at 11 and the services *conclude* at noon. The people *assemble* at half past 10 o'clock, the sermon *begins* at 11 and the services *end* at midday.

Let us now test the words pour and sprinkle. If baptism is pouring, then pouring is baptism, and so of sprinkling. It is a very common expression. He poured or sprinkled water on or upon the man. (Read Matt. 26: 7. Rev. 16: 2, 3, 4. Ezek. 36: 25.) It is perfectly obvious in this case, that the water is the object that is *applied* to the man. Now, if the actual import of baptism is *pouring* or *sprinkling*, then read the sentence by substituting the word *BAPTIZE* for *pour* or *sprinkle*, and it will make good sense. "He *baptized* water upon the man." This would be the natural construction. The absurdity of this sentence is too obvious to need any remark. The water in this case is said to be *baptized*. Query, how do you baptize (immerse) water?

Again it is very properly said, the minister baptized the candidate (*en*) in (or *eis*) into water. (See Matt. 3: 6. Mark 1: 5, 9.) It is evident in this case, that the candidate was the object applied, or *put into the water*. Let us now read this sentence by substituting the word poured and sprinkled for baptized. "The minister sprinkled, or poured the candidate *in*

or *into* the water." Oserve here the *candidate* is said to be *sprinkled* or *poured in* or *into* the water, like salt, molasses, honey or some liquid.—(See Ezek. 21: 3. John 13: 5. Luke 10: 34.) Out of what is he poured? Where is the minister competent to perform this work? What can be more absurd than the idea of pouring or sprinkling *men into* water?—(Read Rom. 6: 3, 4, by substituting *pour* and *sprinkle* for *baptize*—also I Cor. 10: 2. 12: 13. Gal. 3: 27. Eph. 4: 5.)

Let us now bring the words *immerse*, *dip* and *plunge* to this test. The minister *baptized* the candidate in or into the water. By substituting the words *immerse*, *dip*, etc., for *baptize* it will read thus. The minister *immersed*, *dipped*, or *plunged* the candidate in or into the water. This makes good sense, and does not murder the king's English. But how absurd the construction of the following phrase. The minister *baptized*, *immersed*, *dipp'd*, *plunged* or *submerged* water upon the candidate. Now, if pouring or sprinkling is baptism, this phrase is actually correct.—(Read the following passages of Scripture by substituting each of the following words, *baptize*, *immerse*, *plunge*, *dip*, or *submerge* for the words *sprinkle* and *pour*. Ex. 9: 8. Lev. 11: 7, 15, 16, 18, 27. Num. 8: 7. Jer. 18: 21. Mic. 1: 6. Lam. 4: 1. Matt. 26: 7. Luke 10: 34. John 2: 15. 8: 5. Rev. 14: 10. 16: 2.) Is it not ostensibly plain, from these illustrations, that neither pouring, nor sprinkling, is baptism?

Pedobaptist.—The passages you refer to I will read as you request, at my leisure. But notwithstanding your striking illustrations still you know it is often said, "he was poured," "he was sprinkled." Again, you know it is said, "I indeed baptize you *with* water." Is it not evident that water in this place is the object applied to the man, and not man to the water?

Baptist.—It is true, we sometimes hear such expressions, but the peculiar idiom of our language has been strangely warped, to conform the words *pour* and *sprinkle* to the common use of the term *baptize*. We can speak with propriety of liquids and of most things pulverized or capable of being measured in a vessel, being poured; but we cannot with congruity say this of a stand, table, ship, or man. Is it not evident, that these objects can be *baptized*, i. e. *immersed*, but that they cannot be *sprinkled* or *poured* unless pulverized or converted into liquids. Again, is it not plain that *water* cannot be baptized, but that it can be *poured* or *sprinkled*. Now it must be perfectly obvious to every one, that there is such a marked difference between what *can* be done and what *cannot* be done, that they cannot be one and the same thing.*

* Let us illustrate this position by examining the following quotation from Lev. 14: 15, 16, in which the words *pour*, *dip* and *sprinkle* occur in juxtaposition. "And the priest shall take some of the log of oil and (*epicheci*) *pour* it into the palm of his own left hand: And the priest shall (*bapsei*) *dip* his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand, and shall (*ranei*) *sprinkle* of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord." Now if *baptize* (from *bapto* or *baptizo*) means either *pour* or *sprinkle*, then the priest sprinkled or poured his finger in the oil. And in order to do that, he must first have pulverized his finger; and when this was done, and the finger poured or sprinkled into his hand, it is evident that he had not the finger to sprinkle or baptize of the oil seven times before the Lord. Hence the Lord on this supposition required an *absolute* impossibility of him. What can be more palpably preposterous than this? Is it not evident, that each of these words has a definite, specific import? The principle of interpretation adopted by some Pedobaptists, relative to the word *baptize*, if carried out would make the Bible a senseless jargon.

With regard to the expression "baptize you *with* water," I have shown that the Greek preposition *en* translated *with* ought to have been translated *in*, that it was so translated in the earlier versions of the New Testament.—It is so rendered by Dr. Campbell, by Prof. Robinson, by Mr. Henry, by Tyndal, as we have before noticed, by Montanus and also by Barnes. (See note, on Matt. 3: 6.)

The expressions "*en udati*," and "*en to Jourdan*" occur in connection with baptizo, ten times in the New Testament, had they been literally translated as they ought to have been they would have read "*in water*," etc. Sprinkling then could have found no foothold. But if *en* means *with* as you contend then it will make good sense by placing it in its stead. According to *t* is Matt. says that the people were "all baptized of him [John] *with* Jordan," and Mark adds "*with* the river Jordan." Again John was baptizing *with* Enon," etc.—"In those days came John the baptist preaching *with* the wilderness,"—"The voice of one crying *with* the wilderness," etc. Can it be that John the Baptist, baptized *with* Enon — *with* Jordan—and *with* the river Jordan, and that he *erced with*, and preached *with* the wilderness. No one can fail to see the incongruity of these expressions.

Pea baptist.—My friend, if *en udati* ought to have been translated *with* water, why was it not so translated in our present English version?

Baptist.—My brother, you doubtless recollect the account we gave of the first introduction of sprinkling into England. After that, very many of the Bishops of the English Episcopal Church, adopted Calvin's *substitute of a substitute*, and in 1568 issued a translation of the Bible, in which they made several perversions, evidently to favor sprinkling, and among others translated *en with* when connected with baptism, in every instance but three, and would probably have done it in those, if they could, without their perversions appearing too glaring. Our present English translation, prepared by the command of King James, was issued in 1511. The translators of this version were required to follow the Bishops' Bible and to alter it, as little as the original would permit; and "to retain the old ecclesiastical words." The word church was not to be translated congregation, and the term baptism of course was included.* And they merely copied the Bishops' translation of *en, with* and all their other perversions, evidently intended to favor sprinkling.† But notwithstanding all these

* All the ancient Eastern versions render the Greek word baptizo in the sense of dipping—See *Cob. Hist. Bap. Lond.*, 1799. All of the valuable modern Protestant translations, if we except the Vulgate, and the other Western versions modelled after it, among which is our authorized English version which retains the Greek terms. "But, though these versions forsake the track of the Oriental versions, it is not, as is well known, because the translators understood the terms in another sense. To say nothing of continental scholars, who her Romanists or Protestants, the fathers of the Anglican church Wickliff, Tyndal, Cranmer, and others speak plainly on this subject, and so to this day does the book of common prayer, as well as very many of the most learned Pedobaptist divines, as we have seen.

† The most bold and glaring perversion in our translation, evidently made to sanction sprinkling as baptism, is found in Isa. 52: 15. "So shall he (*Thaumazontai*) sprinkle many nations," etc. According to Gesenius, it reads in the Hebrew—"So shall he cause many nations to rejoice in himself."—By referring to this passage in the Septuagint you will find that the word in it, translated *sprinkle*, is *Thaumazontai*, from

perversions retailed in two translations, with all the exertions of the Bishops, it was not till about 1640, nearly a century from the commencement of sprinkling among them, before they could prevail upon the British Parliament to pass a law enforcing it.

Pedobaptist.—Your remarks respecting the inconsistency of translating *en* *with* appear very appropriate. Indeed I see no good reason why this preposition should be translated *in* in the phrases “*in Jordan*”—“*in the wilderness*,” and *with* in the phrases *with water*—*with the Holy Ghost*.—It appears to me that it would have *been* appropriate, if it had been translated *in* water—*in* the Holy Ghost; but very inappropriate, if it had been translated *with* the Jordan, etc. Still I am very far from admitting that *en* always signifies *in* for frequently it signifies *at*, *with*, *by*, etc. But as you have referred to the baptism of Christ and the Eunuch, and placed a considerable stress on the literal import of the Greek preposition *eis* to prove that they were immersed, and that immersion only is baptism, and passed over the preposition *ek* and especially *apo*, I would call your attention to this subject again. You know that the literal import of *apo* is *from* and *eis* is very frequently rendered *to*, *near*, or *unto*.—Now if John and Christ came only (*apo*) *from* the water, it is evident that they went only (*eis*) *to* it. Hence “Philip had no occasion to go farther with the Ethiopian nobleman than John did with our Savior, in order to the administration of baptism. It is reasonable, then, to understand the *eis* and the *ek* of Acts 8: 3^d, 39, as signifying precisely what is indicated by the *apo* of Matt. 3: 16.” Now if *eis* signifies *to* in this baptism of the Eunuch, then *ek* must signify *from*; for “wherever *eis* and *ek* correspond to each other,” says Mr. Ewing, “the extent of the one must measure the extent of the other.” Hence Pedobaptists say that it is evident, that Christ and John, Philip and the Eunuch went down only to the water, to attend to the administration of this ordinance.

Baptist.—My friend, this argument is built upon the supposition that *apo* is the only key that will unlock the meaning of the prepositions *eis*, *en*, and *ek*, used in connection with the verb *baptizo*. Now, you will not deny that the primary, usual signification of the preposition *en* is *in*, *ek*, *out of*, *eis*, *into*, and of the verb *baptizo*, immerse. Hence the primary, usual import of these three prepositions and the verb are decidedly in our favor. Is it not incredible and even absurd then, to suppose that the Spirit of inspiration would use these three prepositions, and the verb itself, in an *unusual sense*, when there were other words better suited to his purpose, if he did not design to express immersion? Now, what can be more preposterous, than to *attempt* to set aside the primary, literal import of the verb *baptizo*, and the prepositions *en*, *eis*, and *ek*, used in connection with it, in order to make them all conform to the usual import of the preposition *apo* used in the account of the baptism of our Saviour. Now, that *apo* is frequently and correctly translated *out of* is evident from the following

Thaumazo which means to admire. It is in the plural number agreeing with the noun *nations*; and literally rendered, it would read,—“So shall many nations be *astonished* or *surprized* at him, and kings shall shut their mouths at him,” etc. A parallel passage occurs in Luke 9: 43. John 7: 21. “I have done one work and ye all (*thaumazeti*) *marvel*.” Substitute sprinkle for marvel in this passage. The same verb is rendered *marvel* in John 3: 7. Acts 3: 12. Gal. 1: 6.—The word *Thaumazo* has not the most distant allusion to sprinkle; and the world might be safely challenged, to produce another example in which it was ever so translated.

passages. Matt. 14: 29, And when Peter was come (*apo*) out of the ship, etc. Luke 8: 2, Mary called Magdalene, (*apo*) out of whom went seven devils, etc. Read also verses 12, 38. Luke 2: 4. But, if we admit that it always signifies *from* it does not militate against immersion. It is very common in speaking of a baptismal scene to say they came up *from* the water, but this neither proves nor implies that they were not previously *in* the water, for *that* is generally understood though not expressed. "*Apo*," says Mr. Carson, "signifies the point of departure from an object, but that point may be in any part of the object to which there is access. If the object be impenetrable it must be from the edge, but if penetrable the departure may be from any part of it. If a fowl, on the opposite side of the river, or in the middle of it take wings, and flying across alights on the hill, we say it flew from the river, just the same as if it had commenced its flight on this side."—It is a common saying that this or that "merchant has just come or returned *from* New York with new goods." Now, though strictly speaking this expression takes him only from the edge of the city, yet its general import is, that he came *out of* the city, unless he states, that he did not go *in* to it. It is in this manner that *apo* is sometimes used to denote *out of*. Now *apo* does not invariably indicate or signify *from*, nor does it determine the import of *eis* to mean *to* when corresponding to it. The following passage will illustrate this fact. "Then went the devils (*apo*) *from* the man, and entered (*eis*) *to* or *near* the swine." Luke 8: 33. But what did they *enter*? Nothing surely, unless they entered (*eis*) *into* the swine. But in v. 30 it is said the devils entered (*eis*) *into* the man. Now instead of *apo*'s indicating that *eis* means *to* in this phrase *eis* requires *apo* to mean *cut of* or *out from*.—From what we have said, it is evident that even the use of *apo* in its usual sense, does not interfere or contradict the use of the verb baptizo and the prepositions named, in their literal sense. But even if it did that, it would be absurd to suppose that the usual import of *apo*, thrown into one scale, would outweigh the primary import of baptizo and the prepositions *en*, *eis* and *ek* cast into the other. Now as *eis* generally signifies *into*, it can not invariably signify *to*; hence being *indefinite*, it cannot require *ek*, which is *definite*, to mean *from*, for the indefinite cannot limit the definite. But *ek* always means *out of*.* Hence we will reverse your demonstration. "Wherever *ek* and *eis* correspond to each other the extent of the one must measure the extent of the other." Hence as *ek* signifies *out of*, in the baptism of the Eunuch, *eis* must signify *into*. For if they came *out of* the water, they must have gone *into* it. This position we are confident cannot be overthrown; for the definite in this case must limit the indefinite.

My brother, by adopting the expedient you have, to set aside the evidence in favor of immersion, (derived from the plain obvious meaning of the term baptizo and three of the prepositions out of the four used in connection with it,) you have adopted and sanctioned a rule which if carried out in its application, by the enemies of the Cross, would overthrow all the fundamental doctrines of the Bible. The Universalist can prove by it that "the wicked shall go away only (*eis*) *to* or *near* everlasting punishment, but not *into* it.—The Unitarian, that the Father was only (*en*) *by* or *with* Christ, but not *in* him; that Christ was only (*en*) *by* or *with* the Father but not *in* him. John 14: 11.—

* Mr. Carson has proved this very conclusively in his examination of the examples contained in Mr. Ewing's Appendix alleged to prove that *ek* sometimes signifies *from* and is synonymous with *apo*. Read from page 213 to 226 of his treatise on Bap.

The Infidel, that Noah and his family, etc.; only entered (*eis*) *to* or *near* the ark, but not *into* it—that the Israelites and the Egyptians only entered (*eis*) *to* or *near* the Red Sea but not *into* it, etc.—that Jonah was only thrown (*eis*) *to* or *near* the Sea, but not *into* it—that Daniel was only cast (*eis*) *to* or *near* the lion's den but not *into* it, &c. &c.

Again, as the translators of the New Testament into our language, were Pedobaptists, they would not be likely to translate these prepositions in such a manner, as to have them speak decidedly against their own practice, unless compelled to do so by conscience and the plain obvious import of the original. When, therefore, these translators inform us that John baptized *in* the river Jordan—that they came (*epi*) *to* the water, and went down (*eis*) *into* the water, and after baptism, came up (*ek*) *out of* the water, etc., we conclude that the original was so plain, that they felt compelled to translate it thus.

But, my friend, as a further illustration of the incongruity of rendering these prepositions by the definitions you assign to them, let us read the following narrative, Luke 8: 29, 30—31. Mark 5: 13. "For he had commanded the unclean Spirit to come (*apo*) *from*, but not *out of* the man." "He was driven of the devils (*eis*) *to* or *near*, but not *into* the wilderness. * * * many devils were entered (*eis*) *to* or *near*, but not *into* him." But what did they *enter* and come *from* or *out of* if not the man? "And they besought him that he would not command them to go out (*eis*) *to* or *near* the deep. And there was there a herd of many swine feeding (*en*) *at, by, or with*, but not *in* or *on* the mountain and they besought him that he would suffer them to enter (*eis*) *to* or *near*, but not *into* the swine. Then went the devils (*apo*) *from*, but not *out of* the man, and entered (*eis*) *to* or *near*, but not *into* the swine; and they (the herd) ran violently down a steep place (*eis*) *to* or *near*, but not *into* the sea, and were choked (*eis*) *to* or *near* the sea," not *in* it, but *on some sand-bank*. What can be more palpably absurd than this construction.

Finally, to show you that Pedobaptists generally take unwarranted liberties in rendering these Greek particles, I would refer you to Prof. Valpy's Greek Grammar, in which he defines them at some length. The following examples will suffice. "*En*," says the Prof., "is used only with verbs, or clauses, indicative of rest, as the Latin *in* with the ablative; as *en to Theo to telos esti*, the end is *in* God.—*En oiko*, at home, i. e. *in* the house;—*en eauto egeneto*, he came to himself, i. e. he was in himself again;—*en Marathon*, i. e. *in* the plains of Marathon. Take also *eis*, as *eis astu ellken*, they came *into* the city;—*ekt'en eis ten Ellada*, he came to Greece, i. e. he not only came to the borders but penetrated also *into* the country itself:—*hymnos eis Apollona*, a hymn to Apollo, i. e. a hymn not slightly touching *upon* but entering *into* the praises of Apollo.

In this manner the learned Prof proceeds till he adduces seventeen examples in which *en* means *in*, and fourteen, in which *eis* means *into* and nearly every example is commonly rendered in English, *by, to, with, at*, etc., showing clearly that though these particles are frequently rendered *at, with, to, near*, still these renderings cannot obliterate the obvious fact that their primary import is *in* and *into*; and they may generally be resolved into that, though it may be more agreeable with our idiom, in some instances, to employ other prepositions.* But, my brother, you are aware

* Dr. Samuel Johnson gives 20 definitions to our English preposition *from*, supported by seventy quotations, and 46 meanings to *for* supported by more than 200 instances of actual usage. But the celebrated Horn Took explodes the Doctor's metaphysics and shows clearly that each of these prepositions has but one primary meaning, and that all the fancied

that the common rule of interpretation requires that the primary import of these particles should always be taken when the construction will permit. Hence from the plain obvious import of these prepositions, we derive a conclusive argument in favor of immersion.

Pedobaptist.—My friend, the argument and illustrations contained in your answer, going to show that the primary import of three of the prepositions out of the four used in connection with the verb, are decidedly in your favor, and that the primary import of the other does not militate against immersion, have convinced me that these prepositions can render us no aid in this controversy. I shall not therefore attempt a reply.—But as you have heretofore referred to Rom. 6: 4, and Col. 2: 12, to prove that baptism is compared to the burial of Christ; and therefore immersion must be the exclusive mode, because *that only* is emblematical of a burial, I should like to hear you answer the Pedobaptist views of this subject. They assert that “the Scripture *no where* refers any part of the *mode* to the burial of Christ, except something may be gathered from these passages. And if it did, immersion cannot have any possible resemblance to the burial of Christ; for he was not covered up in the earth but only laid in a sepulchre; made of a rock. That Christ was never buried, is plain from the evangelist Matt. 27: 59, 60. Again, “we read, Mark 16: 1, that when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene *and others* had brought sweet spices that they might come and anoint him to prepare him for his burial.” Now they “affirm that (strictly speaking) Christ was never buried at all,” he was only laid into a rock. “Now to this, what kind of resemblance can immersion have? None at all.”*

Baptist.—My brother, if Pedobaptists say that Mark or any of the Evangelists represent “Mary Magdalene and others as bringing sweet spices to the sepulchre to anoint Christ to prepare him for his burial,” I know not where they find it. (Such persons should read the last chapter in Revelation.) Read John 19: 39-42. Mr. Carson says [p. 240] that “*Thapto* applies to all kinds of burial. No doubt, originally, in all countries burial was by digging a pit, and covering the dead with the mould. But when repositories were built for the dead, or were scooped out of rocks, the same word was still used. This, in fact, is the case with our own word *bury*.” “The idea that is common to all *burying*, is that of covering the dead, or surrounding them with something to keep them from violation.” Hence when a thing is completely covered it is said to be buried. Hence the Shepherd, when his sheep is covered up with snow, says that they are buried. And when a house falls on its inhabitants or other objects, we say they are buried in its ruins, or when a vessel and its crew sink, we say they are buried in the sea or ocean; they found a watery grave. In the *classics*, a vessel sinking or going under water is said to be baptized. (See Carson’s treatise, pp. 93, 94, 95, 96. Stuart, pp. 299, 300. Judd, pp. 22, 24, 25, 154 to 159.) You doubtless recollect that we have before referred to the fact that weapons were found two hundred years after the battle of Orchomenus *baptized* in the earth etc. (See Judd, p. 41.) Who, my friend, can read these passages and discover no analogy or resemblance between an *immersion* and a *burial*?—But Jesus Christ was buried, as many others were buried. (See the account given by Josephus, of Herod’s burying Aristobulus.) It appears by the

meanings of the Doctor are resolvable into that one. In like manner nearly every one of the 16 meanings which Mr. Parkhurst the lexicographer assigns to *en* and the 18 to *eis* may be resolved into *in* and *into*.

* “Scripture Directory to Baptism,” by a Layman, pp. 37, 38.

account, that they laid him in a magnificent sepulchre, on a bier or couch (*kline*) built as a house for the dead; and this was called a burial. Now, if Christ (strictly speaking) was not buried, then Aristobulus was not.

Let us now look at the representations of Scripture, and see whether they harmonize with the representations of some modern Pedobaptists on this subject. For it should be remembered, that the testimonies we have given, show conclusively that for 16 or 17 centuries, it was the prevailing opinion that baptism was an emblem, or representation of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. (See Stuart, pp. 358. *Christian Review*, Vol. 3, pp. 99 to 105.) "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of earth. Matt. 12: 40. Now, if this representation was fulfilled, it was fulfilled by his laying three days in this sepulchre, which was the "*heart of the earth.*" It is usual for a ridge of rocks to have earth on the top. "The Savior was under the earth here, as well as if he had been buried in a pit at the bottom of the valley." A Geologist we think will not call this statement in question. "Again, Christ's being buried is taught as a part of the gospel." Whoever affirms then that he was not really buried contradicts and questions the truth of the Gospel. See Cor. 15: 1- 4. The last part which reads thus; "For I declared unto you first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." It is worthy of note here, that what the evangelist calls *three days in the heart of the earth* is called by the apostle being *buried*. Now it must be admitted that there is a likeness between this burying and immersion. But no necessity exists that the likeness should regard the manner, in which the body is covered with water. The emblem consists in the actual state of the body as being covered with water. So the likeness to the resurrection, is to be seen, not in the manner the body is taken out of the water, but in the rising itself. "There was no likeness between the way of killing a sacrifice and the manner of Christ's death: There was no likeness between the manner in which Jonah was swallowed by the whale, and again thrown out, to the way in which Christ was carried into the tomb, and in which he came out of the tomb: Yet Jonah in the whale's belly, was an emblem of Christ as being three days in the heart of the earth." The same might be said respecting the resemblance of a loaf of bread in the Lord's Supper to Christ's body. Now as the body of our Savior in the Sepulchre was encompassed on all sides and covered over by it, so the bodies of believers, in immersion in water is encompassed on all sides and covered with this element. CYRIL, of Jerusalem, A. D. 374, says: "You, descending into the water, and being *buried in the water*, as Christ *in the Sepulchre*, arise to newness of life." BASIL the Great, A. D. 360, says: "How shall we accomplish a descent into the grave? By baptism imitating the burial of Christ." Who now will contend that there is no likeness in baptism to the burial of Christ?

Pedobaptist.—The objection which you have so triumphantly answered, was advanced to elicit information, and not because I deemed it a valid or weighty one, though it is regarded as such, by many of my brethren. I presume you are aware, that most of the Pedobaptists represent your denomination as being so *bigoted* and *sectarian* in their views as to contend for a particular mode of baptism, which is the mere costume or non-essential part of religion. This characteristic trait in your denomination, they say, was strikingly exemplified in the schism and division they made in the American Bible Society.

Baptist.—As it respects modes of baptism, my brother, I have said all I

deem requisite on that point. I have only to say that we consider nothing baptism, short of immersion; hence we contend for the rite itself and not for the manner in which it is performed. With regard to the allegation that we divided the American Bible Society, in our zeal for this external non-essential rite, I would remark that the Pedobaptists are the last persons, I should think, that would bring such a charge as this against us. "Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones." Now from the organization of the A. B. S. up to the hour, "when it extinguished the last ray of our hopes," by passing the obnoxious resolution that would cause us to violate our own convictions of duty to God, and to the million of perishing heathen, or else banish us entirely from its connection; yes up to that hour, it received the warm and hearty co-operation of the Baptist denomination. The contributions of the Baptists to this society have amounted to probably more than one hundred thousand dollars.* And yet the Society has appropriated less than 29,000 dollars to aid the translations made by our missionaries. It should be known that the Baptist translators have not altered their course; nor have their versions undergone any change as it regards the translation of the word baptizo. But the Pedobaptists belonging to the Society, changed their course; and altered the purport of their constitution, by annexing a new resolution to it, which produced the schism and division in the society you have unjustly laid to the charge of the Baptists, notwithstanding all their remonstrances. The main object of this measure appears to have been to banish the Baptist translations, not on the ground that they were unfaithful, or that the heathen would be taught by them what was not the meaning of *baptizo*, but because this word and its cognates were faithfully translated by a word equivalent to immerse, which *they* with the learned world admit, is the true meaning of the term. Now, my friend, when we reason with these persons on the true, literal import of the term; and ply them with arguments they find themselves unable to refute, we are met with the reply, "well it will make no difference as it is an external, non-essential rite, and of course not a saving ordinance;"† and yet these same persons make it *so essential*, that they have in effect declared by the resolution they passed, and their subsequent conduct, that none of the funds of the American Bible Society (in which the Baptists at that time, had just as equitable a right as themselves, and into whose treasury they had cast \$50,000 for which they never received aught,) should be appropriated to circulate Baptist translations; and consequently that the millions of heathen for whom these translations were made, may, for aught they will do, perish in their sins and pass on to an eternity of endless woe, for the want of that light and knowledge, which it is in their power to bestow, but which they resolved and determined to withhold, solely on the ground that this little *non-essential word* baptizo is correctly translated instead of being transferred, wrapped up in a dead language.‡

* See the 2d annual report of the American Foreign Bible Society, p. 61.

† Now it is worthy of remark here, that the pleading the unimportance of this truth by Pedobaptists, as a justification of their non-compliance with the requirement of Christ, (indicated by the plain specific import of the term baptizo,) is a virtual acknowledgment that *they* are wrong and *we* are right.

‡ The language of the learned Dr. Campbell is apposite to this case. "Does that deserve to be called a version, which conveys neither the matter nor the manner of the author? Not the matter, because an unintelligible word conveys no meaning; not the manner, because what the author said

Now in the pertinent language of Dr. Johnson, (in his letter on the translation of the Scriptures into the Gaelic language,) "If obedience to the will of God be necessary to happiness, and knowledge of his will necessary to obedience, how can he that withholds this knowledge or delays it [on such a pretext] be said to love his neighbor as himself?" My brother, it appears to me that the Pedobaptists, who are ignorant of the true import of baptizo, and "voluntarily or wilfully continue thus are guilty of all the crimes which that ignorance produces; [be they divisions, schisms, controversies, etc.] as, to him that extinguishes the tapers of a light house, might be justly imputed the calamities of shipwrecks."

Again, you are well aware I presume that the A. B. Society has aided translations in which the most important words have been so rendered, or mistranslated as to teach and sanction the greatest errors. And although it refuses to aid in the distribution of Baptist translations, still, at the same time, it continues to circulate versions in which the word *baptizo* is rendered precisely as in our versions by a word signifying to *dip* or *immerse*, its resolution to the contrary notwithstanding. See Mr. Maclay's address, pp. 12, 13.

As it respects the charge of *bigotry* and *sectarianism*, which is so often brought against the Baptists and their missionaries, because they have translated the word *baptizo* by a word signifying to *immerse*, in those versions of the Bible which they have given the heathen nations in their own tongue. I beg leave to introduce, as a complete refutation of this charge, the language of the late learned and eminently gifted servant of the British and Foreign Bible Society, Mr. Greenfield, who some years since in his defence of the Serampore Baptist translators, says: "Bigotry, that is blind zeal and prejudice, the Baptists cannot justly be accused of, while they have the *primitive sense* of the term, and the rendering of so many ancient and modern translations, as the foundation upon which they have grounded their version; nor can they consistently be charged with sectarianism, while they are found in company with the churches of Syria, Arabia, Ethiopia, Egypt, Germany, Holland, Sweden, Denmark and others, together with the church of England itself. If they be bigots I know not what name the advocates of pouring or of sprinkling, who have *no such basis to rest on*, merit; and if theirs be a sect, it must be confessed to be a very ancient, and very extensive one.

"But there is another point of view," he continues, (and while he writes these memorable words, he says, as a preface to them, 'I wish it to be distinctly understood that I am neither a Baptist nor the son of a Baptist,') "in which the opponents of the Serampore missionaries should consider the subject: and one which involves the most important consequences. Before they arraign the British and Foreign Bible Society as guilty of a gross and unpardonable dereliction of duty in aiding the Serampore translators, and prefer a recommendation for them to withdraw that aid, they should be fully prepared to carry their censure, as well as their rec-

simply and familiarly, the translator says scholastically and pedantically. And if former translators have from superstition, from fear of giving offence, or from any other motive, been induced to adopt so absurd a method; shall we think ourselves obliged to imitate them? * * Shall we make less account of communicating clearly the truths revealed by the Spirit, than of perpetuating a phraseology which contributes to the advancement of ignorance and of an implicit deference in spiritual matters to human authority?" Such would be the effect of transferring the word *baptizo* and its cognates in heathen languages instead of translating it.

ommendation, to a much greater extent. In consistency, if that aid be withdrawn from the Serampore missionaries because they have rendered *baptizo* to *immerse*, then must it also be withdrawn from the churches of Syria, of Arabia, of Abyssinia, of Egypt, of Germany, of Holland, of Denmark, &c.; and the venerable Peshito Syriac version, the Arabic versions of the Propaganda, of Sabat, &c.; the Ethiopic, the Coptic, and other versions must all be suppressed. If, however, they are not thus prepared to carry their recommendation to its fullest extent, then must they close their mouths forever against their Baptist brethren. But should a faction so far prevail over the good sense of the committee, and the sound and catholic principles upon which the Society is founded, and which has ever been its boast and glory, as well as the most powerful means of its extraordinary success, then its honors will be laid in the dust; and from a splendid temple in the service of which the whole Christian world could cordially unite, it will dwindle into a contemptible edifice, dedicated to party feelings, motives, and views. The broad basis upon which it is founded is its strength and security; contract this within narrower limits and it falls into ruins." The remarks of Mr. Greenfield are applicable to the proceedings of the American Bible Society.

Pedobaptist.—My friend, if the Baptists have the ground and argument on this subject as you seem to intimate, why are the Pedobaptists so much blessed of God?

Baptist.—I answer, why has Popery with all its glaring superstitions been permitted to extend itself over one half of the Christian world?—Why has the Mahomedan religion been allowed to spread its triumphs over some of the fairest portions of the globe? We cannot tell. Why are some churches holding error among ourselves, prospered? If you are a Presbyterian, I ask, why are our Methodist brethren favored of God, while they reject the important doctrines of election, and the perseverance of the Saints? If you are a Methodist I inquire, why are Presbyterians distinguished by the favor of Heaven, while they embrace such pernicious errors as election and the Saints' perseverance?" Similar questions equally appropriate might be raised respecting the differences of the Episcopalian and Congregational modes of church government. But it is not our province to answer these questions, or to determine how great errors churches may hold and yet be prospered of God, for the sake of the truth they wield in his cause. Your denomination, my friend, I presume you will find are blessed, and prospered, in proportion to their real piety and activity in disseminating those doctrines of the Bible, which are fundamental to salvation.

But the proper question to be asked here is not "why has God prospered Pedobaptist denominations?" but has he blessed them in the administration of the rite of infant, or even believer's sprinkling to the same extent that he has the Baptist denomination, in the observance of the rite of primitive immersion?

As a conclusive answer to this question, I would introduce the testimony of the Rev. L. PORTER of Lowell, Mass., (given in the Christian Watchman, June 21st, 1839,) in confirmation of the remark made by Prof. JEWETT, in his work on Baptism, "*t'at God has frequently blessed this ordinance [believer's baptism] to the conversion of souls.*" "This idea," says he, "admits of abundant proof. Hundreds of Christians can testify, that their first permanent, serious impressions were obtained at the river's side. It was when witnessing the baptism of an only sister, by the late beloved Prof. KNOWLES, then pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Boston, that my own attention was attracted to the subject of religion.

"It has been my happiness to baptize almost every month for the past four years, and I do not know of one instance in which the ordinance has not been blessed to the conviction and conversion of one or more individuals. No doubt each time persons have been seriously affected, and perhaps converted to God, whose names I shall not know until the judgment day.

"I have made extensive inquiries among intelligent Pedobaptist ministers and members, of various denominations, whether they ever knew a person converted to God, or even deeply convicted of sin, by witnessing the sprinkling of a child, or an adult, and have not yet learned that such a case ever occurred. Allow me to ask, through the Watchman, whether any individual, pastor, deacon or member, can cite any well-authenticated instance? [No answer has ever been given to this question.] Query, which is God's ordinance, the one he blesses by his Spirit, or the one he does not?

"I have baptized, during the past four years, upon an average, one Pedobaptist individual each month, more than half being members of churches. Last Sabbath I baptized a married lady, who has been for several years connected with a Congregational church in this city. Also at the same time a Congregational clergyman, Rev. Tobias Pinkham, for the last three years pastor of a Congregational church in Dracut.—Mr. Pinkham's attention to this subject was awakened by learning that Prof. Jewett, who was with him at Andover, had changed his sentiments. Thus the 'Presbyterian Elder,' who became a Baptist at Marietta, has been blessed to the conversion of two Pedobaptist ministers already. Query. Suppose the Elder had become a Baptist in sentiment, but had not gone forward in baptism, would brethren Jewett and Pinkham have been baptized at this time? Query. How much sin would the Elder been guilty of if he had not been baptized at the time he was? *

"Judson became a Baptist by studying the Bible upon that point to meet the Baptists in India. So did Rice. Merrill became a Baptist by searching the Bible for arguments against them, so did Chapin and Grosvenor, and Hackett, and Loomis, and Nott, and Jewett, and Pinkham, and many others. What will be the result of other candid, and pious, and intelligent Pedobaptists, who undertake to preach against the sentiments of the Baptists?"

Nor is it by any means true as the objection seems to assume, that the Baptists have not been visited by the smiles of the King of Zion. Without creed or catechism, without General Assemblies, or other high judicatories of the church, without archbishops or bishops, they have walked together harmoniously, uniting with each other in efforts to extend Christ's Kingdom till they embrace in their congregations a larger body of persons if not a larger number of believers than any other denomination in the United States. The Baptists were the pioneers in the modern missionary enterprise. They were the originators of the Monthly Concert of Prayer, and of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the parent of the American Bible Society. They have also taken the lead in the translations of the Bible. "Within the last forty years their missionaries have

* Who that feels it his duty to follow the example and command of his Savior in this expressive ordinance knows how many are kept back from the performance of this duty by his example, and again how many might be convicted of their sins and converted to God by his conscientious obedience to the truth. God never commands a man to do any thing which it is either wise or prudent for him to neglect or disobey.

translated the Bible into between forty and fifty different languages."—Indeed all the versions they have made, embrace the languages and dialects spoken by more than half of the heathen world. To them in a special manner are we indebted for the civil and religious liberty we now enjoy.

Pedobaptist.—My brother, how do you substantiate the assertion that we are "indebted to the Baptists for our civil and religious liberty?"

Baptist.—They were the people that first advocated these sentiments. It is to Roger Williams, the founder of Rhode Island and the first Baptist church in America, that we turn for the first dawnings of that Sun of civil and religious freedom which has arisen upon our Republic, in the effulgence of his glory. Mr. Bancroft the historian says: "He was the first person in modern Christendom to assert in its plenitude, the doctrine of the liberty of conscience, the equality of opinions before the law; and in its defence, he was the harbinger of Milton, the precursor and superior of Jeremy Taylor. For Taylor limited his toleration to a few Christian sects; the philanthropy of Williams compassed the earth."—Nourished by sentiments like these, sentiments emblazoned on the pages of inspiration and imbibed from the sacred volume, he disdained alike the despotic laws of church and state, and the frown of the ecclesiastical denunciation of his Pedobaptist brethren—he left the soil where religious liberty was not permitted to dwell, and sought a home with the savage and infidel, which his own brethren, who had fled from the sword of persecution in England, refused him. It was in these trying circumstances that he broke away from the shackles of religious thralldom, and opened up an asylum in the wilderness, (which he then called *Providence*,) for the persecuted of every denomination. Here, he and his associates, in 1636, established a code of laws "in which," says Judge Story, "we read for the first time, since Christianity ascended the throne of the Cæsars, the declaration that 'conscience should be free, and men should not be punished for worshipping God, in the way they were persuaded he required.' And from this declaration of principles Rhode Island has never departed. These peculiar sentiments of religious liberty, which have since been adopted by every state in the Union, the Baptists were the first to proclaim, exemplify, and defend. Hence, as we should naturally suppose, they choose their own religious teachers, whom they regard as their "servants for good" acknowledging no foreign jurisdiction, and no man their master but Christ. These distinguished sentiments and principles in the religious system of the Baptists, have given birth and vigor to the Republican habits, institutions, and government of our country.*

Pedobaptist.—But, my friend, after all you have said about religious liberty, etc., is not the question about baptism of trifling importance?

Baptist.—But is it a question of trifling importance, whether men shall lay unhallowed hands on an ordinance of the great Head of the Church and profanely strip it of its significance and its teachings—whether they shall strike down, in the temple of gospel truth, the noble pillar of justifying faith—whether they shall lift from the sinner's conscience, a weight of

* Some years previous to the American Revolution, there was a Baptist church near the house of Mr. Jefferson in Virginia, whose monthly meetings he often attended. Being asked how he was pleased with their church government, he replied that "it had struck him with great force, and interested him very much; that he considered it the only form of pure democracy that then existed in the world, and had concluded that it would be the best plan of government for the American colonies."

personal responsibility, laid there by the Lord Jesus himself—whether they shall abrogate a law of the King of Saints:—or whether they shall keep the ordinances, as they have been delivered in the Statute Book of Heaven, revering the will of the Sovereign, and observing all things whatsoever he hath commanded?'

Infant baptism, in direct opposition to the whole tenor of Scripture, which teaches us that every one must believe, be baptized and give *an account of himself* unto God, declares that the act of the parent in the observance of this rite, liquidates all obligations of the child, even if he become a believer, to obey the command of Christ in the ordinance of baptism—that the parent's faith shall save the child! A celebrated Pedobaptist minister in Boston says that a Christian parent who uses the ordinance of infant baptism aright, "may be sure, that the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls has written the name of that child before him, in letters which his infinite forbearance and mercy will long keep from being blotted out, though the child perversely break his father's covenant." "If the parents die while the child is young, the remembrance of its dedication to God, and the confident belief that it was received into his covenant, will help them to look at it from the dying pillow with peace."*

In the language of Prof. Jewett: "Is not infant baptism as exhibited in these extracts manifestly at war with the great doctrine of JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH? This teaches, that *faith*, one's *own* faith, not another's,—*faith*, not *works*, either his own or another's shall save a man. Shall the Baptists be charged with bigotry, for endeavoring to uphold a doctrine on which the great Apostle of the Gentiles has so strenuously insisted, as fundamental to the Christian system."

"I need say nothing of the fatal influence of the views I am examining on multitudes of careless adults, who are encouraged in a life of impenitence, by complacently dwelling on the covenant made with God on their behalf, when their parents presented them for baptism. From their infancy, they have been accustomed to reflect, that they have received 'the seal of the covenant,' have been 'made members of Christ,' and 'children of God,' having been regenerated with the Holy Spirit. Is it strange, that such persons should feel themselves safe, and at liberty to continue in sin."

Pedobaptist.—My friend, Pedobaptists say that it is very evident, that "Baptists attach too much importance to the ordinance of baptism."

Baptist.—"I might reply that on some occasions Pedobaptists attach too little importance to it. When individuals are led to inquire respecting the mind of Christ, do not even ministers endeavor to quiet their uneasiness, by telling them, 'the subject is of no consequence'—'it is a mere external ceremony'—'it is not worth while to trouble one's self about it.' When young converts are seeking to know the will of their Lord, respecting the ordinances of his church, do not their spiritual guides often ply them with 'dissuasives' from investigation? Do not parents endeavor to restrain their children from examination, because it is pleasant to have all the children in the same church with the parents? Are there not numbers who will not listen to a sermon on the subject? And do not even *theological students*, while pursuing their studies, content themselves with a partial view of the matter, forming their conclusions without reading a single Baptist author?" Do not many other Pedobaptists, whose minds have been troubled, by reading the plain declarations of Scripture on this subject, endeavor to remove their scruples by turning away from

* "The Baptized Child," by Nehemiah Adams, Boston, pp. 36, 58.

the Bible, and every thing that treats of this matter; or else attempt to quiet their consciences, by persuading themselves that it is a mere *non-essential rite*, and that their influence or usefulness would be abridged, if they were to become Baptists? Are not others prevented from the Scriptural observance of this rite by being told that immersion is "*indecent*," or at least "unsuited to the manners of a polished age?" Have not even some Pedobaptist ministers in this manner, endeavored to hold up the primitive rite of immersion enjoined by our Savior and confessedly practised by the church for centuries in an odious light? Does it not appear from these facts, my friend that many Pedobaptists attach too little importance to this Gospel ordinance?

Pedobaptist.—My brother, if you think that Pedobaptists attach too little importance to this rite, I conclude it must be, because you lay an unwarrantable stress upon it. I suppose the Baptists believe it to be a saving ordinance.

Baptist.—By no means; so far are we from regarding it as such, that we believe that all the waters of Jordan or Lake Erie, cannot wash away sin—that a person must profess faith in Christ and give satisfactory evidence that he has been *washed and cleansed from sin by the atoning blood of Christ* before we can consider him in the light of Scripture, an eligible subject for this rite. This in fact constitutes one of the most distinguishing traits in our denominational character. But, though we do not regard this ordinance essential to salvation, yet we believe that the scriptural observance of it, is essential to obedience. We believe the rite, though an external one, is full of rich instruction to the believer, if it be observed in the manner enjoined by Christ. "And as every rite must have a form, if we do not preserve the form we do not practise the rite. Hence, immersion is essential to baptism. Hence, baptism (immersion) is essential to obedience to Christ;—essential to the highest instruction and comfort of believers;—essential to the best moral impression on unbelievers;—essential to the purity and stability of the church of Christ."

But, my friend, as we are repeatedly charged with laying an undue stress on baptism, we would state as our clear conviction that if the truth were known, it would be seen that it is the Pedobaptists themselves, who lay unauthorized stress upon this ordinance. It is well known that *pouring, sprinkling, and infant baptism*, all had their *origin*, (and even existence for centuries) in the belief, that baptism regenerated the soul, and qualified the subject for admission into heaven. Believing that all who died unbaptized were irrevocably lost, for those on sick beds who were considered in imminent danger, and immersion consequently deemed impracticable, they first invented pouring as a substitute for baptism and afterwards sprinkling. The statements of Prof. Stuart and Bp. Smith of Kentucky, corroborate this historical fact. Hence we perceive the importance Pedobaptists formerly attached to this ordinance. Let us now see what importance is attached to it by modern Pedobaptists.

MR. BARNES, a Presbyterian, in his Note on Mark, 16: 16. "It is worthy of remark, that Jesus has made *baptism* of so much importance. He did not say, indeed, that a man *could not* be saved without baptism, but he has strongly implied, that where this is neglected, *knowing it to be a command of the Saviour*, it endangers the salvation of the soul. *Faith and baptism are the beginnings of the Christian life: the one, the beginning of piety in the soul; the other, of its manifestation before men, or of a profession of religion.** And no man can tell how much he endangers his eternal interest by being ashamed of Christ before men.

* Is the baptism of an infant the manifestation before men, of piety in its soul?

MATTHEW HENRY, a Congregationalist and the distinguished commentator. "The gospel contains not only a doctrine, but a covenant; and by baptism we are brought into that covenant. Baptism wrests the keys of the heart out of the hands of the strong man armed, that the possession may be surrendered to Him whose right it is. * * * This then is the efficacy of baptism; it is putting the child's name into the gospel grant.—We are baptized into Christ's death, i. e. God doth in that ordinance, seal, confirm, and make over to us, ALL the benefits of the death of Christ.—Infant baptism speaks an hereditary relation to God that comes to us by descent."—*Treatise on Baptism*.

DR. WATERLAND, an Episcopalian and celebrated scholar and divine: "Baptism alone is sufficient to make one a Christian, yea, and to keep him such even to his life's end; since it imprints an indelible character in such a sense as never to need repeating."

Do Presbyterians charge us with placing an undue stress upon this ordinance? And what stress do they lay upon it?

In their "Confession of Faith" they say: "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only as a solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also, *to be unto him a SIGN and a SEAL, of the covenant of Grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins.*"

Is this objection brought against us by Congregationalists? And what stress do they place upon baptism?

Hear the learned Dr. Dwight. "When children die in infancy, there is much and very consoling reason to believe that they are accepted beyond the grave." He further adds, "There is, I think, reason to hope well concerning other children dying in infancy; but there is certainly *peculiar reason* for Christian parents to entertain strong consolation with regard to their offspring." My brother, it is evident from the language of Dr. Dwight that he supposed baptism to contribute very much to the salvation of infants.—The language of Matthew Henry which I have already given is still more remarkable. See also "The Baptized Child," pp. 36, 58, 33,

Do Methodists urge this objection? And how essential or important do they deem this ordinance?

The celebrated John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, says: "*By Baptism, we who were by nature children of wrath, are made the children of God. And this regeneration, which our church in so many places ascribes to baptism, is more than barely being admitted into the church, though commonly connected therewith. * * * Being grafted into the body of Christ's church, we are made the children of God, by adoption and grace. John 3: 5. By water then, as the means the water of baptism, we are regenerated, or born again: whence it is called by the apostle, the 'washing of regeneration'—In all ages the outward baptism is a means of the inward.—Herein we receive a title to, and an earnest of, a kingdom which cannot be moved. In the ordinary way there is no other means of entering into the church or into heaven.—If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism, seeing, in the ordinary way they cannot be saved unless this be washed away by baptism.*"—Wesley's Works, vol. 6, pp. 15, 16. N. Y. 1832.

Do Episcopalians present this objection? And what stress do they lay upon this rite?

In their Catechism occur the following question and answer: "How many sacraments hath Christ ordained in his church? *Answer.* Two only, as generally *necessary to salvation*—that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord." After an infant is baptized the minister is required

to say, "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that *this child is regenerated*, and grafted into the body of Christ's church, let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits." And then the prayer of Thanksgiving is offered thus "We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to *regenerate this infant* with the Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy church." The child thus baptized is required to learn his catechism before confirmation. In that catechism, my brother, may be found this question and answer, which show that the child was taught to view baptism in the same light.

Question. "Who gave you this name?" *Answer.* My sponsor in baptism wherein I was made a *member of Christ, the child of God*, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven."

Should this objection come from Roman Catholics, (the originators of infant baptism and sprinkling,) let us see what stress is laid upon this institution by them.

Take the Canons and Catechism of the Council of Trent: "If any one shall say that baptism is not necessary to salvation, let him be accursed. Sin, whether contracted by birth, from our first parents, or committed by ourselves, is, by the admiral virtue of this sacrament remitted and pardoned.—In baptism, not only sins are remitted, but all the punishments of sins and wickedness are graciously pardoned of God. * * * By baptism we are joined and knit to Christ, as members to the head. By baptism we are signed with a character, which can never be blotted out of our soul. Besides the other things which we obtain by baptism it opens to every one of us the gate of Heaven, which before, through sin, was shut."*

I trust, my brother, after these quotations from confessions of faith and standard authors of different denominations, that you will not again charge us with placing too much stress upon this ordinance. Whatever meaning these extracts may have been designed to convey, I certainly have never met with expressions so extravagant in any Baptist author.

Pedobaptist.—My brother, I was not aware before, that any standard Pedobaptist author attached so much importance to this rite, as these extracts evidently import. There is another objection that Pedobaptists very frequently urge against your denomination. The Baptist denomination is a modern sect. It is but about two hundred years since their origin, or that any one ever heard of such a sect. With what show of reason then can they claim to hold the doctrines of the primitive churches?

Baptist.—My friend, if it could be proved that our denomination has not existed 100 years that would not convict us of error, or prove that

* Baptism is deemed so indispensable by Roman Catholics that even laymen, physicians, females, etc., are authorized to administer the rite in extraordinary cases. In the latter part of the 17th century, Father Jerome Florentini of Lucca published the 4th edition of a quarto to explain, confirm, and direct the baptism of infants unborn. No less than forty imprimatures and recommendations from divines, bishops, physicians, universities, etc., accompanied this book. See *Rob. Hist. of Bap., Lond. Ed., 1790, p. 432.* In the year 1751, F. E. CONGIAMILÆ, Doctor of Divinity and Laws, of Palermo, published in the Italian language a quarto book of 320 pages "dedicated to all the guardian angels to direct priests and physicians how to secure the eternal salvation of infants, by baptizing them when they could not be born." We thus see how far the superstition of infant baptism has carried people.

our principles are of recent origin.* To do this, it must be shown by irrefragable evidence that they are not the same, as those observed and practised by the Apostles and primitive Christians.

The allegation that the Baptist denomination has not existed but about 200 years is not sustained by indubitable evidence.* We find by the statistic report of the Baptist Union, convened in London in 1838, that there were not less than three Baptist churches then in being, formed in England, A. D. 1600. It has also been affirmed that "the Baptists originated in Germany about the year 1522 at the beginning of the Reformation." It is true, that no denomination of *Protestants* can trace the origin of its present name farther back than about the time of the Reformation; and most of them have originated since that time. But the Baptists as a sect, cannot in justice be called Protestants, having always existed independently of the Romish Church as we have abundant evidence to show. Still it appears to be true, that their present name was assumed about that time; probably in opposition to that of Anabaptists, with which their enemies were constantly reproaching them.

The Penny Cyclopædia published in London says: "Little is known of the Baptists in England before the sixteenth century. Their name then appears among the various sects who were struggling for civil and religious freedom. Their opinions, at this early period were sufficiently popular to attract the notice of the national establishment, as is evident from the fact that at a convocation held in 1536, they were denounced as 'detestable heresies utterly to be condemned.' Proclamations followed to banish the Baptists from the kingdom; their books were burnt and several individuals suffered at the stake." "William Sawtre [in the time of Henry the Fourth] was the first in this country that suffered at the stake for his religious opinions, in 1401, and who was supposed to deny infant baptism; and Edward Wightman, a Baptist of Burton upon Trent, [in the reign of James the First] was the last person who suffered this cruel kind of death in England. So that this denomination has the honor of both leading the way, and bringing up the rear of all the martyrs who were burnt alive in England; besides which a great number of those who suffered death for their religion, in the 200 intervening years, were of the Baptist denomination."† And from Davis' History of the Welch Baptists, it is evident that persons believing our peculiar sentiments, have

* But if antiquity of origin alone is to prove a denomination right, then it must be conceded that the Protestant Pedobaptists do not stand on an equal footing with the Catholics. The Church of England, i. e. the English Episcopal Church, "first formed and organized out of Popery as their own authors abundantly assert, and in 1534 adopted immersion at their first organization. This fact is confirmed by all history, by the parliamentary act of 1534 enforcing immersion," and by their rituals the first of which was printed in 1547. [See Hague's Historical discourse, and J. F. Bliss' fourth letter.] The Presbyterian form of government was invented by the reformer John Calvin not far from 1541.—The principles of the reformation commenced in Scotland in 1527 and the Presbyterian polity was introduced on the island in 1592 by Andrew Melville.—The first Congregational church was formed in the north of England in 1602 by the Rev. John Robinson. [See Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.] All of these Protestant dissenters generally practised immersion down to the seventeenth century.

† Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge—Backus' Hist. of the Am Baptists.

existed in Wales, in every age of the church from the days of the apostles.* But, my friend, we do not contend that the primitive Christians were denominated Baptists, but that they were what would *now* be called by this name. We have abundant historical evidence that persons holding our distinguishing sentiments (viz: that the baptism of believers on a profession of faith, constitutes the only valid scriptural baptism,) have existed in every age of the Church, from the commencement of the Christian Era, down to the present time.

We have also proved by the highest Pedobaptist testimony that infant baptism had no existence till the latter part of the second or the beginning of the third century. We might add the testimony of many others to this point, but we have time to name only a few. SALMASIUS and SUICERUS. "In the two first centuries no one was baptized except being instructed in the faith and acquainted with the doctrine of Christ, he was able to profess himself a believer." CHAMBER'S CYCLOPEDIA. "It appears that in primitive times none were baptized but adults." *Article Baptism.* CURCELAUS says: "That infant baptism was introduced without the command of Christ: that in the two first centuries after Christ, it was altogether unknown: but in the third and fourth was allowed by a few, in the fifth and following ages it began to obtain in divers places."—The testimonies of BISHOP BARLOW, DANVERS, M. DE LA ROQUE, T. LAWSON and many others might be adduced in confirmation of this fact.

Pedobaptist.—My friend, excuse me for interrupting you, but if the testimonies you have adduced are to be relied on, I would inquire how infant baptism was first introduced?

Baptist.—It was on the ground that it was deemed necessary to salvation, and persons dying without it were consequently lost. Hence the Encyclopedia Americana says: "The doctrine of Augustine, that the unbaptized were irrevocably lost, made the baptism of children general."—These are Augustine's words: "Not only persons who are come to the use of reason, but also children, and infants newly born, if they die without baptism do go into everlasting fire." The learned Strabo, who wrote, A. D. 850, says: "It is to be noted that in the primitive times baptism

* "In [the year] 596, Gregory, bishop of Rome, sent Austin the monk into England, to bring the Saxons into conformity to the church of Rome: for as long as the British churches possessed the country, they kept sound in the faith, and pure in the worship, order and discipline of Christ. At that time the old Britons were principally in Wales. In Bangor on the North [of this principality] was a college containing 2,100 christians. This college sent forth many useful ministers of the Gospel. Austin got many of these to a council he kept about Worcestershire; where he propounded to them the embracing the Romish rites, etc., which they refused. Then he said to them, since you will not assent to my *hests* generally, assent you to me specially in three things: The first in your keeping Easterday, as it is ordained [at Rome.] The second, that you give *Christendom* to children. And the third, that you preach to the Saxons, as I have exhorted you: and all other debate I shall suffer you to amend and reform among yourselves. *But they would not.*" Whereupon he brought the Saxons against them in war and nearly extinguished their faith. (*Abridged from H. Danvers.*) Humphrey Loyde gives a graphic description of the destruction of the college of Bangor by the arrogant monk Austin, in which he says these worthy men, and the whole house, together with their Library (more precious than gold) were entirely destroyed.

was given to those only who were arrived to maturity of body and mind, but when diligence about our divine religion increased, the orthodox understanding, that the original sin of Adam did involve in guilt, lest children should perish, appointed them to be baptized for the pardon of sins." *Wall, vol. 2, p. 12.*

We might subjoin a multitude of testimonies of the same purport; but we will only mention the names of Anselm, Bernard, Dodwell, Vossius' Waterland, Church of Wittemburgh, Church of Rome, Council of Trent' and Church of England.—(See chap. 9th of Westlake's view of bap.)—Even after the introduction of infant baptism, many did not receive it, and many opposed it. This fact is confirmed by the historical account of the following fathers and eminent men, whom we are informed "were born of christian parents and yet not baptized till adult age," viz: Constantine who flourished about A. D. 325. Basil and Gregory Nazianzen about A. D. 360. Ambrose A. D. 374. Jerome A. D. 380. Chrysostom A. D. 398. Augustine, 400. St Austin, 597, and others.* This fact is also confirmed by "the pressing exhortations, found in early writings addressed to professed christians to come to baptism,"† together with the awful *anathemas* pronounced at different times by the dominant party, upon those, that denied infant baptism. ROBINSON states in his *Researches*, that "there is no trace of infant baptism among the Catholics of Spain earlier than the year 517." And history informs us that it was introduced into England by Austin in 596. I would further add that there is strong evidence on record, that the infants spoken of by Origen and others, were not natural infants. CARDINAL BELLARMINÉ observes: "Origen's infants were capable of repentance and martyrdom but the infants of the reformers were incapable of either." Bp. VICTOR's account of the church of Carthage and CLEMENT's hymn corroborate this statement of Bellarmine. See *Westlake on Bap. ch. 8th.*—From these testimonies, it is clear that the baptism of natural infants, was nor so early, not so general, as many Pedobaptists imagine.

As it regards the rite of primitive immersion, for which the Baptists so strenuously contend, we have shown that the whole world with few exceptions practised it for fifteen centuries, and England for sixteen;—while the Greek church have continued it till this time. We would also remark that Mosheim with all his prejudices against the Baptists, has given a description of the primitive churches which will not apply to his own, the Lutheran, nor to any sect in Christendom except the Baptists. "The churches in those early times," he says, "were entirely independent, none of them subject to any foreign jurisdiction but each one governed by its own rulers and laws." "A bishop during the first and second century, was a person who had the care of one Christian assembly. In this assembly he acted not so much with the authority of a master, as with the zeal of a faithful servant." "Baptism was administered in the first century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed for that purpose, and was performed by immersion of the whole body in water." Mr. Robinson the historian, after a most thorough research, confirms these statements of Mosheim, and expressly affirms that "All this time they were Baptist churches; and though all the fathers of the four first ages, down to Jerome, were of Greece, Syria and Africa, though they gave great numbers of histories of the baptism of adults, yet there is not on record the baptism of a child till the year 370, when Galates, the dying

* (See Miller's History, Wall's Hist. Int. Bap., Du Pin., Grotius, etc.)

† (See Basil's Orat. Exhort. ad Bap. in Wall's Hist. pt. 1, chap. 12, § 3.)

son of the Emperor Valens, was baptized, by order of the monarch, who swore he would not be contradicted. The age of the prince is uncertain, and the assigning of his illness as the cause of his baptism, indicates clear enough that infant baptism was not in practice."

Pedobaptist.— My friend, before I interrupted you, you stated that you "had abundant evidence to show that the Baptists have always existed independently of the Roman Catholic Church, and cannot therefore in justice be called Protestants." Now as this is a new idea to me, it would be very gratifying to hear what historical evidence you have to substantiate it.

Baptist.— In the third century the primitive churches became corrupted from their primitive simplicity, and then we hear of the consecration of baptismal water; the use of sponsors; the imposition of hands at baptism; material unction at confirmation; prayers for the dead; infant communion and infant baptism, &c. Then those who contended for "the apostles' doctrine and fellowship and for the faith once delivered to the saints," finding they could not "resist the torrent of corruption, gradually separated themselves from a community that had become unworthy of the Christian name." The prevailing party assumed the name Catholic church, and denominated the true church heretics. This party under different names such as Novatians, Donatists, etc., "declared their community to be the only true church," and "notwithstanding the representations of their adversaries" they have no doubt "some just claims to be regarded as the pure, uncorrupted and apostolic churches of Christ," they baptized anew those who came over to them from the Catholics and other sects. The Novatians called themselves *cathari*, that is, pure.—Crantz (in his History of the United Brethren) says: "These ancient Christians, who, besides the several names of reproach given them, were at length denominated Waldenses, from one of their most eminent teachers, Peter Waldo, date their origin from the beginning of the fourth century; when one Leo, at the great revolution in religion under Constantine the Great, opposed the innovations of Sylvester, Bishop of Rome."

"The Cathari, or Puritan churches of the Novatians, also, had at that very period (about A. D. 325) been flourishing as a distinct communion for more than seventy years all over the empire, maintaining, by the acknowledgment of their enemies, the self-styled *Catholics* the integrity of the true faith, together with the purity of discipline and the power of godliness which had generally disappeared from the *Catholic* churches. The Puritans being exposed to severe and sanguinary persecution for dissent, from age to age were compelled to shelter themselves from the desolating storm in retirement; and when they reappear on the page of contemporary history to propagate their principles, they are styled a new sect, and receive a new name, though in reality they are the same people.

"The same great principles of attachment to the word of God, and determined adherence to the simplicity of its doctrines, discipline, institutions, and worship, in opposition to the innovations of a secular spirit and policy on the one hand, and of false philosophy or of pretended apostolical tradition on the other, may be traced under the name of Novatians, Donatists, Luciferians, and Arians, from the third to the seventh century." In the seventh century, they were denominated Paulicians, and falsely by some Manichæism; but from the middle of this to the end of the ninth century, they worthily sustained by their preaching, their lives, and their martyrdoms, their claim of being the genuine descendants of the primitive churches. From Asia Minor they spread themselves over Europe. * * * They were called in France Bogres, or Bulgarians,

Tisserands or Weavers, *Bos Homos* or Good Men. In Germany, they were called by the old name of Cathari, or by corruption Gazari, i. e. Puritans. In Italy, Paterines, Josephists, Arnoldists and Fratricelli.— They were denominated Waldenses [i. e. “inhabitants of the valleys,” as Mr. Robinson shows,] as early as 1100, sixty years before Peter Waldo. Soon after this, in Languedoc and Provence, they received the name of Petrobrusians and Henricans, from their celebrated leaders Peter de Bruis, & Henry his successor, who powerfully advocated and greatly extended their principles among the most intelligent classes, (from 1110 to 1168.) From the places where they flourished they were called Toulousians, Albigenes, and afterwards Poor Men of Lyons and Leonists. * * * In 1160 some of them crossed from Gascony to England, where they were called Pophlicians and Publicans, corruptions of the original name, Paulicians. About this time arose the celebrated Peter Waldo, of Lyons, whose labors, learning, zeal and liberality greatly extended their principles.

“Their enemies confirm their great antiquity. ‘Reinerius Saccho, the bloody inquisitor,’ Dr. Maclain says, (in his notes to Mosheim vol. I, p. 332,) ‘who exerted such a furious zeal for the destruction of the Waldenses, lived about 80 years after Peter Waldo, and must therefore be supposed to have known whether he was the real founder of the Waldenses or Leonists, and yet it is remarkable that he speaks of them as a sect that had flourished above 500 years. This carries us back to the year 660, the time of the appearance of the Paulicians, or rather of their great revival and increase under the labors of Constantine Sylvanus. Indeed, there is not wanting evidence to show that churches of the Puritan order existed at that time in the West as well as the East. In the year 553, nine Bishops of Italy and Switzerland openly refused communion with the Pope of Rome, and the churches under their care persisted in their dissent.’

Reinerius, himself a Catholic, has given these Waldenses or Poor men of Lyons, one of the best christian characters. “Of all the sects which have been or now exist,” says this inquisitor, “none are more injurious to the Church (i. e. of Rome) for three reasons. 1. Because it is more ancient. Some aver their existence from the time of Sylvester; others from the time of the Apostles.* 2. Because it is so universal. There is scarcely any country in which this sect has not crept. 3. Because unlike other heretics they have a great appearance of piety, they live justly before men, believe rightly all things concerning God, &c. A concession like this coming from such a source speaks volumes.” They were strongly attached to the Holy Scriptures and regarded them as the only source of faith and religion.—Their scriptural simplicity and soundness of belief is acknowledged by their adversaries, and amply confirmed by their own authentic monuments and confessions of faith, several of which are printed at length in Jones’ History of the Church.—Their purity and excellence of life and manners is conceded by an ancient inquisitor and Seisselius, archbishop of Turin, also says: ‘Their heresy excepted, they generally live a purer life than other Christians’—‘Their enlightened favor, courage, and zeal is admitted by Reinerius and he assigns that as the cause of their great increase. ‘All of them,’ says he, ‘men and women, night and day, never cease from teaching and learning’ and

* Dr. Maclain says that Reinerius himself ‘even mentions authors of note who make their antiquity remount to the apostolic age. When the Papists ask us, where our religion was before Luther, we generally answer, *in the Bible*. But to gratify their taste for tradition, and human authority we may add to this answer *and in the vallies of Piedmont*.’

he adds they teach those whom they bring over to their party, what manner of persons the disciples of Christ ought to be; and that they do by the doctrine of the evangelists and apostles, saying that those only are the followers of the apostles who imitate their manners of life. Hence their steady opposition to all corruptions and anti-christian usurpations of the Roman Catholic Church.—Their views of liberty of conscience were enlightened. ‘They affirm,’ says the inquisitor, ‘that no man ought to be forcibly compelled in matters of faith,’ in this particular, and in their just ideas of the nature and character of a church of Christ, they were far in advance of the reformers, Luther and Calvin. Their views of the gospel church, as given by Seisselius and Reinerius, coincide with Mosheim’s account of the churches of the first century. It is also evident from the account their enemies give of them, that they were, and that too on principle, opposed to the church of Rome, and to all national established churches. See *Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge, Art. Waldenses, Novatians, Paulicians, etc.* Also Jones’ *Hist.*

Some of the popish writers own, says President Edwards, that those people never submitted to the church of Rome. One says: “The heresy of the Waldenses is the oldest heresy in the world. It is supposed that this people betook themselves to this secret place among the mountains, to hide themselves from the severity of the heathen persecutions which were before Constantine the Great. And thus the women fled into the wilderness from the face of the serpent. Rev. 12: 6 and 14.” (*Hist. of Redemp. Prd.* 3 Pt., 2: 1.) To this agrees Beza who says, “As for the Waldenses, I may be permitted to call them the seed of the primitive and purer church.”

Mr. Jones who has given us the most complete account of this interesting people, says they were Anti-pedobaptists, i. e. Baptists. Dr. Gill affirms that all their writings, from the Noble Lesson in 1100, down to their confessions of faith, in 1565, to be in favor of baptism of believers only. It appears certain that the Cathari, the Paterines, the Berengarians, the Arnoldists, the Petrobrusians, and Henricans, i. e. the earlier Waldenses were anti-pedobaptists.

The Waldenses and Albigenses do wholly reject infant baptism.—*Danvers’ reply to Willis*, pp. 130, 131. For further evidence on this point see *Dutch Martyrology*, pp. 307—320. Also *Danvers on Bap.* pp. 257, 252, 258, 253, 267, 131, 226, 136.

From “An ‘Account of the Origin of the Dutch Baptists,’ or Menonites, published at Breda, in 1819, by Dr. Ypeij, prof. of theology at Groningen, and the Rev. J. J. Dermont, chaplain to the king of the Netherlands, learned Pedobaptists. With this account Mr. Ward fills several letters, and from it we shall make some extracts. In the opinion of these learned men “the Menonites are descended from the tolerably pure evangelical Waldenses, who were driven by persecution into various countries; and who during the latter part of the twelfth century fled into Flanders, and into the provinces of Holland and Zealand, where they lived simple and exemplary lives, * * free from the charge of any gross immoralities, and professing the most pure and simple principles which they exemplified in holy conversation. They were therefore in existence long before the reformed church of the Netherlands.

“There were then two sects among them, distinguished by the name *perfect* and *imperfect*. The greater part of the first sect and the whole of the second, were certainly among the most pious Christians the world ever saw, and the worthiest citizens the state ever had. History removes every doubt on this subject.

“In the year 1536, their scattered community obtained a regular state of church order, separate from all Dutch and German Protestants. This

advantage was procured them by the sensible management of Menno Simons, who had formerly been a popish priest. This learned, wise, and prudent man, was chosen by them as their leader. He purified also the religious doctrines of the Baptists by reclaiming some of the perfectionists to order and excluding others.

"We have now seen that the Baptists who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in latter times Menonites, were the original Waldenses; and who have long in the history of the church received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community, which has stood since the days of the apostles, and as a Christian society which has preserved pure the doctrines of the Gospel through all ages. The perfectly correct external and internal economy of the Baptist denomination, tends to confirm the truth, disputed by the Romish church, that the reformation brought about in the sixteenth century, was in the highest degree necessary; and at the same time goes to refute the erroneous notion of the Catholics, that their communion is the most ancient," [and I might add, the idea entertained by many of the Protestant Pedobaptists, that the Baptist denomination and their principles are of recent origin] Thus far Dr. Ypeij and Dermont.

"This testimony from the highest official authority in the Dutch Reformed church, is certainly a rare instance of liberality towards another denomination. It is conceding all the Menonites or Baptists claim. It should be added that they have constantly but politely declined the salaries which the government of Holland offers to all denominations under its authority."

The concession of the learned Mosheim goes to confirm the statements of Dr. Ypeij and Dermont, he says: "The true origin of that sect which acquired the denomination of Anabaptists . . . and derived that of Menonites from the famous man to whom they owe the greatest part of their present felicity, is hidden in the *depths of antiquity*. The Menonites are not entirely in error when they boast of their descent from the Waldenses, Petrobrusians, and other ancient sects, who are usually considered witnesses of the truth in the times of general darkness and superstition."

The views of the Menonites respecting baptism may be derived from the writings of their learned and distinguished leader Menno, who says: "After we have searched ever so diligently, we shall find no other baptism but dipping in water, which is acceptable to God and approved in his word." See *Ency. Reli. Knowl. Art. Menonites, Mosheim, and Ward's letters*.

LYMBORCH, Prof. of Divinity in the University of Amsterdam, says: "To speak candidly of what I think of all the modern sects of Christians the Dutch Baptists most resemble both the Albigenses and Waldenses." Other testimonies might be adduced but this will suffice.

Pedobaptist.—My friend, the abundant evidence you have furnished to show, that the Baptists are not of recent origin, but that persons holding their distinguishing sentiments have existed, under different names, in every age of the church, and that too, independently of the Romish communion, has been not only interesting, but very edifying --I also feel compelled by a sense of justice, to acknowledge that your answers to my questions, objections, etc., have removed much of the prejudice, as well as the most prominent objections, I entertained against your denomination. But as I am still ignorant to some extent of your principles of else communion, Providence permitting, I should like to converse with you, at some convenient opportunity on that subject.

Baptist.—My brother, suppose you call next Monday evening if your avocations will permit.

Pedobaptist.—Agreed.

CONVERSATION RESUMED.

Pedobaptist.—My friend, in compliance with your request, I have called this evening to converse with you on the subject of communion. It is but just to state here, that the evidences you produced from Scripture, etc., in the former part of this Conversation, to prove that *Baptism* is an *indispensable prerequisite* to communion, were conclusive to my mind, and completely confirmed me in the belief of the truth of that position. And as you furnished the same Scripture evidence to support the sentiment, that faith is an *indispensable preliminary* to baptism, I feel myself likewise constrained by evidence and conscience, to admit the truth of this position. I also coincide with you in the belief, that baptism is an essential prerequisite to church-membership. But notwithstanding all this, it appears to me that there is something wrong about this *close communion*. Now, my brother, can you inform me what that is.

Baptist.—I am very willing to acknowledge, that there is something wrong about this close communion, as you term it. But are the Baptists wrong in this matter? If so, then it must either be in their principles, or their practice, or in both; and as you have frankly acknowledged that their principles are in harmony with Scripture, it follows, as their practice is the carrying out of those principles, that if they are wrong, then the Scriptures are equally wrong;—a position, my friend, I am sure you will not maintain. But as the question still returns; what, or where is the wrong? In reply I will endeavor to specify some things that I deem wrong in the Pedobaptists. It is wrong in them to appeal to the sympathies of community, by exciting and keeping up a continual outcry about the close communion of the Baptists, in order to render them odious in the eyes of community. It is manifestly wrong, for any person to give currency or publicity to even a questionable report, calculated to diminish the reputation which a man sustains in community. In doing this, one may be guilty of propagating *falsehood* as well as slander. Again, it is wrong for any man to make another the object of ridicule, and in this manner prejudice others against him; and thus impair his reputation, by lessening him in the estimation of community. In the epistle of Titus, “aged women are cautioned against being false accusers, The original is still more impressive. This infernal disposition of slanderers is frequently seen in the manner in which they attack persons most eminent for piety and usefulness. Baxter was represented as a murderer, Whitefield as all that was vile, Our Savior as a glutton and drunkard.” Again the Jews called him an impostor, and then crucified him. The martyrs were represented as heretics, before they were beheaded, or burned at the stake. This same disposition still exists. Almost all denominations of Christians, even in this age of unbounded charity, unite in applying the epithet close communion as a term of reproach to the Baptist denomination. This corroborates the remark you made at the commencement of this conversation, viz: that the Baptist denomination are “every where spoken against.” They are stigmatized and calumniated by almost every sect as close communionists; when in fact that epithet is no more applicable to them than it is to the Pedobaptists. Is it not plainly the design of those who raise this outcry about the close communion of the Baptists, (especially those who are acquainted with their principles and practice,) to stigmatize them, and in this manner prejudice ignorant minds against them? How often does this old leaven of vile misrep-

sentation sour, prejudice, and disgust many liberal minds, and prevent them from making any thing like an impartial examination of our distinguishing sentiments? Have not these slanderous reports been circulated to a great extent, and produced too general an impression, that we are a rigid, illiberal, self-righteous, and bigoted people? Thus it seems that our opponents in the absence of better arguments, intend to load us down with reproach, and if possible impair our religious influence in community.

Now the effects produced by these unwarranted representations are truly lamentable. It is an undisguised fact, that the great majority of young converts are unacquainted with the sentiments of the Baptists, and the doctrine and precepts of the New Testament; and are, therefore, incapable of drawing the dividing line between Christian communion or affection, and Church communion or fellowship. It is also well known that these persons regard with feelings of peculiar affection all who bear the name of Christian. Knowing these facts, Pedobaptists are well aware that nothing will exert a more withering influence upon their affectionate feelings towards us, than the glowing representation that we are *rigid close communionists*. Hence we conclude, their main object in stigmatizing us with this offensive epithet, is obviously for effect. Now there are multitudes, who, by reading the New Testament, have been solemnly impressed with the conviction, that believers are the only proper subjects, and immersion the only Gospel baptism, who nevertheless have been deterred by these statements, from the performance of their duty. Many of these persons are thus prevailed upon by these and other representations, to give up the idea of being immersed; and to unite with those denominations, which are represented as being open and liberal in their communion and feelings. It is in this manner, my friend, that the misrepresentation of our views and sentiments, produces wrong impressions upon tender minds, and induces many to deviate from the plain path of duty, and to disregard the admonitions of conscience; the impressive example of our Savior, and the institution of his own appointment at the very outset of their Christian career. Many of this class may now be found in every division of the Pedobaptist church who have never "answered a good conscience" in this matter; and consequently will live in trouble all their days, unless they possess moral courage enough to come out and follow the dictates of their own consciences and the plain directions of the word of God. Query. Does the observance of baptism (sprinkling) for baptism (immersion) *save these persons by "the answer of a good conscience towards God?"* or are they saved by *the troubles of a guilty conscience?* On this subject we speak from experience, and from facts that have come within our own observation.—That the Baptists are too deficient in the superior grace, *charity*—this Scripture and Centre of the Christian system, must be conceded. But that other denominations possess a greater share of this superior, crowning grace, and that, in consequence of their particular views of communion, cannot be admitted. For you know, my brother, that with a single exception, we are all agreed as it respects the terms of communion.—In addition to this I would also remark that one of the peculiar and prominent characteristics of the Baptist denomination and Clergy, is a kind and liberal feeling towards the members of other communions. It is true, they tenaciously adhere to what they deem *the faith; and order of the gospel*. But then where can you find a denomination that is more willing, or ready to unite with all Christians in spiritual communion, and in efforts to advance the cause of Christ, than the Baptists, when no sacrifice of conscience or duty is required?

But they are even traduced because they are unwilling to sacrifice these. Now, my friend, I object to this course pursued by many Pedobaptists, as unchristian. If we are wrong, let them convince us of our error by argument, and not resort to the clamorous outcry about close communion, in order to prejudice people against us. Again we object to their degrading the ordinance of Baptism as a mere non-essential, and then exalting the Lord's Supper, as the soul, sum and substance of all Christian affection.

Pedobaptist.—I must acknowledge, my brother, that there is too much truth in your remarks. Yet very many of those who stigmatize the Baptists as close communionists, verily believe, that they are as *rigid, illiberal, and bigoted* as they represent them. These false reports in circulation have so prejudiced their minds as to prevent a thorough examination of your sentiments. Hence their prejudices have induced them to adopt and give currency to this gratuitous slander.—Now, although these persons' motives may be good, still they are culpable for endorsing these reports without a knowledge of the truth, therefore their conduct cannot be justified by the law of love.

But you mentioned two kinds of communion or fellowship, *Christian and Church*. As this is a distinction I never before heard made I should be much gratified to learn in what it consists.

Baptist—In regard to the distinction between Christian, and church communion, I would remark that it is no cause of wonder to me that you never heard of it. For it would seem by the conversation of many Pedobaptists, that they think there is, there can be no Christian communion, besides that manifested in the participation of saints with each other at the Lord's table. This I conceive to be a great mistake.—Whenever Christians of different denominations, engage in conversation with each other, on experimental religion, they find their hearts burning within them in a kindred flame of holy affection. They feel that they have obtained like precious faith;—that they are children of the same kind Father;—that their joys—their sorrows—their interests—their hopes are in a great measure one. This *love of the brethren* the apostle adduces as evidence that we "have passed from death unto life." This is what we term Christian communion or affection.

But on the other hand, when a Christian and an unbeliever providentially fall in company with each other, and the subject of experimental religion is introduced, we instantly perceive, that there is no union of interest, sympathy or feeling; in short, that there is no Christian fellowship or affection existing between them.

From this view of the subject, we perceive that faith or a change of heart is essential to Christian communion or fellowship. And as we have before proved that Christian baptism is an essential qualification to church communion, the distinction is perfectly obvious. Now, as we all practise upon the same principles in church communion; wherein are Baptists more close or restricted than the Pedobaptists?

Pedobaptist.—My friend, I am much pleased with your views of this subject. The distinction you have made between Christian and Church fellowship, I think is marked and judicious. Hence it appears that

Faith is a *prerequisite* to Christian communion, and also to baptism; and that

Baptism is a *prerequisite* to Church communion, and also to church membership.

Now, my friend, since your sentiments and mine so perfectly coincide on the mode, and subjects of baptism, I feel conscious that I shall not be

able to do justice to the Pedobaptist side of this question. And as I am desirous of hearing it discussed I would introduce to you my Presbyterian brother, (who has been listening for some time to our conversation) and by the way I would remark that he is a warm advocate for sprinkling and Pedobaptism. I would like therefore to hear you converse with him on the subject a short time.

Presbyterian.—My brother, I have been listening to your conversation with much interest; and I concur with you both, that baptism is a prerequisite to communion, and to church-membership. But why, my brother, do your denomination still cling to close communion?

Baptist.—My friend, you speak as though close or restricted communion is peculiar to us as a denomination. If this is the case, we are not aware of the fact.—If I mistake not, you said that you “regarded baptism as a prerequisite to communion.” If so, I suppose you restrict your communion to those whom you deem baptized.

Presbyterian.—Most certainly. You do not suppose that we commune with unbaptized persons!

Baptist.—Suppose that several pious Quakers, who believe that they have been baptized in the Holy Spirit, and who deem nothing else Gospel baptism, should so far depart from their order, as to request admission to the Lord’s table; would you, could you grant their request?

Presbyterian.—We could not grant their request.—Their opinion, or belief that they have been baptized, can never be a rule for our conduct. As “every one must give an account of himself unto God,” we must act agreeably to the dictates of our own consciences, and what we deem the plain directions of the word of God. But then, my friend, why do you refuse to commune with us?

Baptist.—For the same reason precisely, that you refuse to commune with the pious Quakers, i. e. because we verily believe you are not baptized. We believe, as peculiar to us, that nothing constitutes Christian baptism but the immersion of a professed believer.—Again we both practise on precisely the same principles. Hence, if we are close communionists, so are you. You reserve to you selves the inalienable right of judging who is, or who is not baptized. We do the same.

Presbyterian.—This looks all very fair; but then it is a fact that we commune with Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Methodists, etc., and you will commune with none of them. Is it not self-evident then, that we are more liberal and open in our communion than you are?

Baptist.—In principle I think not. The obvious reason why you commune with all these persons is, because you deem them baptized. Did we believe the same we should commune with them; but we do not, after a thorough examination of the subject, believe that pouring or sprinkling is Scriptural baptism. For that reason we cannot commune with those denominations. Now if there is any thing in which we are more restricted than you, it is in baptism,—not in communion. For unless we labor under a mistake, your denomination are more restricted in their communion, than the Baptists.

Presbyterian.—I would like to know how you prove this assertion.

Baptist.—Our denomination commune with all whom they baptize, who do not forfeit this privilege by a disorderly walk; but the Pedobaptists are so much more restricted in their communion, than the Baptists, that they baptize very many whom they regard as fit recipients of the rite; and then debar them from their communion table, without preferring one charge against them for apostacy, or disorderly conduct; or without even being able to point out any particular change in their character since

their baptism. Does not this prove conclusively, that Pedobaptists are more restricted in their communion than the Baptists?

Presbyterian.—My brother, what evidence have you to sustain the affirmation, that the Pedobaptists baptize those with whom they will not commune?

Baptist.—Your denomination with other Pedobaptists baptize the children of believing parents, whom they regard as gospel subjects of that initiatory rite, and then shut them out from the communion table. By what authority do you admit them to the first gospel sacrament, on the faith of their parents, and then refuse them admission to the other.*

Presbyterian.—My friend, the Bible requires that communicants should be able to “discern the Lord’s body,” and to “examine” themselves before they “eat of that bread and drink of that cup.” Hence it is plain that as infants are incapable of this, they have no right to be admitted to this sacrament.

Baptist.—The Bible too, as we have plainly shown, requires *believers* only to be baptized. And as infants are incapable of exercising faith, they of course are excluded from this rite.† For they must be able to

* Dr. John Edwards says: “Infant communion was a catholic (universal) doctrine,—herein all the Fathers agreed.” Mosheim says “that the sacred supper was in this [the second] century given to infants.” Cyprian, who was born at the close of the second, or beginning of the third century, alludes to the practice of infant communion as a thing well known in his time.” “The majority of nominal Christian churches, which uphold infant baptism, plead alike for infant communion to this very day. The Greek Church, the Armenians and Abassens, the Maronites, Muscovites and Cophti, who as Dr. Wall observes, constitute the ‘biggest half of Christendom,’ are as tenacious for the application of the one ordinance as the other to infant subjects.” Where is there any incongruity in this? What evidence can be urged to support one of these ordinances, that cannot with the same propriety be urged in the defence of the other. If one was in the church at the close of the second century, so was the other. If one was considered necessary to salvation, so was the other. If one is a gospel ordinance, so is the other. If there is any impropriety in administering the eucharist to infants, there must be the same impropriety in administering to them baptism. Under the old economy, circumcision and the passover were intimately connected.—Venema in his Ecclesiastical History says: “In the ancient church these two sacraments in respect to the subjects, were never separated the one from the other.”

† Milton the celebrated author of *Paradise Lost* says, in his “*Christian Doctrine*,” “Under the gospel, the first of the sacraments commonly so called is baptism, wherein the bodies of believers who engage themselves to newness of life are immersed in running water [then there were no baptisteries] to signify their regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and their union with Christ in his death, burial, and resurrection.

“‘From this statement he argues:’ Hence it follows that infants are not to be baptized, inasmuch as they are incompetent to receive instruction, or to believe, or to enter into covenant, or answer for themselves, or even to hear the word. For how can infants who understand not the word, be purified thereby, any more than adults can receive edification by hearing an unknown language? For it is not that outward baptism, which purifies only the filth of the flesh, which saves us, *but the answer of a good conscience*, as Peter testifies; of which infants are incapable. Besides baptism

understand, that when they "have been baptized into Christ," that they "have put on Christ." That is, they have invested themselves with the distinguishing robe of Christian profession; (such is the idea conveyed by the original term *enedusasthe*.) and henceforth they are to walk "in newness of life."*

Presbyterian.—The qualifications you speak of, applies to adults, not to infants.

Baptist.—So do the qualifications you require for communion, apply to adults, not to infants.

Presbyterian.—My friend, I presume you are aware that our denomination are more liberal in their views, and practice of infant baptism than formerly. A man of a family may now be a member of our church and observe this gospel ordinance, in having his children sprinkled or not, as he pleases. Thus you see how liberal we are in our baptism.—And again, we cheerfully invite you, with all other evangelical Christians, to commune with us at the Lord's table. But you will neither accept our invitation, nor invite us to commune with you: is it not plain then, that you are truly the *close communionists*?

Baptist.—My friend, infant baptism (sprinkling) has probably been the legitimate cause of much uneasiness and trouble in your churches. This is unquestionably the reason, why you are so liberal as not to insist upon it as a positive duty. But if it is a gospel ordinance what right have you to suffer your members to live in the total neglect of it. The concessions of Dr. Woods and Prof. Stuart, and the increasing neglect of this rite among Pedobaptist churches, indicate that the time is not far distant, when they will cease to practise this unscriptural ceremony. The practice of believers' baptism (i. e. immersion) is becoming more and more frequent among all Pedobaptists. Thus we may see that a gradual revolution is in progress which will eventually demolish the barrier that now separates us. Now, we affectionately invite you as Christians, to demolish this barrier, by communing with us, our Savior, the apostolical and primitive Christians, for the first two centuries, in the subjects, and mode of baptism; and with the Christian world, for 1300 years, in the observance of the primitive rite of baptism. And then we will most cheerfully accept your invitation to unite with you, in the participation of the Lord's Supper. Now, my dear brother, if you are unwilling to do this, I ask you, I ask the world, *who* are emphatically *the close communionists*?

is not merely a covenant, containing a stipulation on one side, with a corresponding engagement on the other, which in the case of an infant is impossible; but it is also a vow, and as such can neither be pronounced by infants, nor be required of them. It is remarkable to what futile arguments those divines have recourse to, who maintain the contrary opinions."

* Baptists commune with those whom they baptize, unless in their view they depart from "apostolic doctrine and fellowship." But the Pedobaptists shut out from the communion many whom they professedly baptize, and even their children they subject to the same treatment. Is not this close communion?

The Presbyterian Confession of Faith, p. 273, says: "A particular church consists of a number of professing Christians, with their offspring, voluntarily associated together for divine worship, and godly living." Again, page 327, "Children born within the pale of the visible church, and dedicated to God in Baptism, are under the inspection and government of the church,—and when they come to years of discretion, if they be free from scandal, sober and steady, and have sufficient knowledge to discern the Lord's body, they ought to be informed it is their duty and privilege to come to the Lord's Supper."

QUESTION 62 (large Catechism.) "What is the visible church?"

ANSWER. "The visible church is a society made up of all such as, in all ages and places of the world, do profess the true religion, and of their children."

Porter on Christian Baptism, p. 108, says: "Baptized children are members of the visible church."

Presbyterian.—If you will not commune with us at the Lord's table, why should we commune with you in your baptism?

Baptist.—We have shown that we could not commune with you, without sacrificing our principles: Besides, baptism comes first, in the divine commission; (and if we were to judge from the number of times it is mentioned in the New Testament, we must conclude, to say the least, that it is of as much importance, as the Lord's Supper;) hence the reason is obvious, why you should first commune with us in this ordinance. Then we can travel on with you in the highway cast up by Zion's King, for the ransomed to walk in to the Lord's Supper. But, my friend, if *you*, in direct violation of the great law of the commission, and contrary to apostolic example, refuse to commune with us and the Christian world for centuries, in this first gospel ordinance, (baptism) when you can do it, without violating either law, principle, or conscience; is it not self-evident, that you alone are responsible for all the evils of close communion? Again, if you cannot commune with *us* and the *apostles* in the primitive observance of the first of the gospel ordinances, how can you expect us to commune with *you* in the second; or, in other words, if you will not commune with *us* in our strict adherence to *apostolical example*, how can you expect us to commune with *you* in deviation from *their* example.

Presbyterian.—My brother, the apostles celebrated the Lord's Supper, and we, in imitation of their example, do the same. Hence we do not ask you to commune with us, in deviation from apostolic example, but in our compliance with it.

Baptist.—My friend, it is generally admitted that the Apostles and primitive Christians observed the rite of baptism, i. e. immersion, prior to the celebration of the Lord's Supper. But as you have not followed their example in this respect, we could not in compliance with your request unite with you in the celebration of this ordinance. Now it is a fact, that what constitutes the principal barrier, that divides the Baptist and Protestant Pedobaptist denominations and communions, is the substitution of *infant and adult baptism* (sprinkling) for *believers baptism* (immersion.) *This partition wall* was erected by Pedobaptists, and they generally lend all their influence to sustain and perpetuate it.

Presbyterian.—How, my friend, do you make it appear that the Pedobaptists were the originators of the barrier, which separates the Baptist and Pedobaptist denominations?

Baptist.—My brother, from what we have already said, it is evident, that if all Christians could come to a perfect agreement, as it regards the mode, and subjects of baptism, there would be, there could be nothing in the ordinance of communion, about which they could be divided. The Christian church commenced with the practice of baptizing (i. e. immersing) believers; and she was bound by the commission, and apostolic example to continue in this practice. Now, as *this is apostolic ground*, it is plain that here we ought all to *meet* and *walk*; and it is worthy of remark too, that so long as Christians occupied this ground, there was no divisions in the church. But when the church left this apostolic ground, and substituted pouring, sprinkling, and infant baptism for the ordinance of believers baptism, it produced *contention* and *division* among the true disciples of Christ. Now, if this aberration from apostolic practice, was the original cause of these divisions, it is manifest, that it must still be the cause. Hence, it is obvious, that those, and those only, who lend their influence, to sustain and perpetuate the cause of these divisions among Christians, are responsible for all the evils that grow out of them.

Presbyterian.—It is rather hard I think for you to throw the origin of

the contentions and divisions of the church upon Pedobaptists; while they stand ready to commune with *you*. And besides; we sincerely, and conscientiously believe that we have been baptized, and therefore deem ourselves proper subjects for admission to the communion table.

Baptist.—My friend, we “as sincerely and conscientiously believe that you have not been baptized;” and therefore “deem you *improper* subjects for admission to the communion.” Now does conscientious sincerity prove that a man is in the right? If so, then we are both right; though diametrically opposed to each other in our views of baptism.—Let us examine this subject: Suppose two men should meet each other on the road, within 30 miles of New York, both sincerely believing that they were bound direct to the city, yet travelling in opposite directions. I ask, would their sincerity prove them both right? Is it not evident that one of them must be wrong? Take an illustration from Scripture: Paul was equally sincere before, and after his conversion; but did his sincerity prove him right in both these cases. The disciples would not admit this; for when he “*assayed to join himself to them,*” they would not receive him till they were convinced that he was right in action, as well as in sincerity.—Finally, if you sincerely believe that you have been baptized, I as sincerely believe that you have not been baptized. Now, if your sincerity proves your baptism valid, for the same reason my sincerity proves it invalid. What, my friend, is this argument worth?

Presbyterian.—Either something or nothing. But who is to decide in this case what is baptism?

Baptist.—Why, either the candidate, or the church.—If the candidate alone is to decide of the validity of his own baptism, and of his qualifications for church-membership and church communion, then for the same reason, he alone may decide of his qualifications for any office in the church. If this right be conceded to the candidate, of what use is the church? For what was it constituted?—That each member should control it according to his own caprice? What would be the result if such a principle were conceded and carried out in practice? It can but be evident that the Church must be the judge; and in deciding who is eligible for admission to the church or communion, she must be governed by the *scriptural terms* of admission. These may be learned from the Christian commission, Matt. 28: 18—20, and the practice of the apostles.

Presbyterian.—Can you inform me, my brother, what was the practice of the apostles?

Baptist.—We have before shewn, though you was not present, that they invariably followed their commission, which requires faith before baptism, and baptism before church communion, etc. See Acts 2: 41, 42; 8: 12; 9: 18; 10: 48; 16: 15, 33. This was their uniform practice, and there is not a solitary instance on record, of their having deviated from it. Now, the apostles require us to follow them, as they followed Christ; to walk as we have them for an *ensample*; to keep the ordinances as they *have delivered them to us*; and to withdraw ourselves from every brother that walks disorderly, and not according to the tradition which we *have received*

* I believe with Dr. Owen, that the end and object which Christ had in view, in constituting and continuing his church on earth, was to transmit from age to age the purity of his worship. “For,” says he, “those churches do exceedingly mistake their duty, and the very end of their being, which make it not their principal business to take care of the due celebration of the worship which the Lord Christ hath appointed.” Hence if we would accomplish this desirable object, we see the importance of strictly adhering to the Divine directions, in the admission of members to the church, and to its ordinances.

from them. And they declare in positive terms, that "they received of the Lord what they delivered to the church," 1 Cor. 11. 1, 2; Phil. 3: 17; 1 Cor. 4: 16, 17; Col. 2: 5—8; 2 Thess. 3: 6; 2: 15. Now, my brother, it is evident, from these scripture facts, that the church is authorized by apostolic example to admit immersed believers into the church and to the communion, but any deviation from this would be a violation of gospel order. My brother, suppose that a person, holding, in your view, very erroneous sentiments, should desire to unite with your church, would you admit him?

Presbyterian.—It would not answer, my friend, for us to admit a man to membership in the church with very erroneous sentiments; or merely because *he thinks* he possesses the requisite qualifications for admission. Were we to receive members on *this* principle, they might eventually become the majority in the church, and control the whole of its affairs, and govern it as they please; or if they remain the minority they might create divisions and contentions without end.

Baptist.—But where, my brother, is the consistency in granting a person's free admission to all the privileges of the church, without even subjecting them to either its burdens, or its discipline? If it is consistent, to admit them to the communion table, then it is equally as consistent, to admit them to regular membership in the church. For the Lord's Supper is a *church ordinance*, (1 Cor. 11—24;) and consequently should be administered to none but church-members. Hence there is a manifest inconsistency in carrying these elements out of the church.

But then I perceive that you are not in favor of unrestricted communion; for this cannot exist, so long as the different denominations adhere to their distinguishing sentiments, or maintain discipline in their respective churches, or require the adoption of their articles of faith for admission to their church.

Presbyterian.—How, my brother, do you make it out, that we are not in favor of free communion, when we cheerfully invite you all to the Lord's table?

Baptist.—Suppose that a candidate should be refused admission into your church, because he could not adopt your articles of faith, would not this be establishing *close* or restricted communion? Again suppose that one of your ministers should so far depart from your faith and practice, as to become a Baptist in the mode and subjects of baptism, and should still remain a minister in your church, and continue to preach what he deemed truth, and practice accordingly; would your churches, could they fellowship him in this course? Must they not exclude him, however distinguished he may be for holiness or success, or else dispense with a part of their creed? And if they exclude him from the church, would not that be restricted communion?

Presbyterian.—Most certainly! But suppose we were so far to dispense with our creed, as to retain the offender? This surely would not be close communion.

Baptist.—My friend, if your church were to retain this minister, would she not retain in her bosom the very elements of discord and disunion? Can "a house divided against itself stand?" "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" And if you could dispense with this part of your creed, and fellowship this minister, I see no reason why you may not with the same propriety, unite with the Baptist Church and fellowship them. Nothing would hinder but your mode of church government; and as that does not prevent your members from uniting *with*, nor your ministers from

becoming pastors of Congregational churches, that surely could present no serious obstacle.

Presbyterian.—I see plainly, my brother, that there would be a glaring inconsistency in retaining this minister. The very principle which we must adopt to do it, would if applied eventually overthrow our denomination.

Baptist.—My friend, be cautious in avoiding this inconsistency, that you do not involve yourself in another. Indeed, the very principles of church communion, adopted by Pedobaptists, frequently involve them in the most gross inconsistencies.

Presbyterian.—How do you make good that statement?

Baptist.—My friend, Pedobaptists and mixed communion Baptists, not only uniformly invite to their communion those whom they would exclude, if they were members of their church, but almost invariably censure the Baptists because they will not do the same. As an illustration, let us suppose, that it has become evident to your church, that the minister I instanced must be excluded. He pleads in justification of his course, that he can find nothing in the Bible to sanction either infant or adult sprinkling, and that two of your most distinguished divines, John Calvin, the founder of your church, and Dr. Campbell, the learned translator of the four Gospels, declare unequivocally, that "the word BAPTIZO signifies to immerse, both in sacred and classical authors," and Calvin adds, that "it is certain that immersion was practised by the ancient church," and that "Christ requires teaching before baptism, and will have believers only admitted to baptism," etc.; yet nought will avail, and they exclude him. Suppose now that this minister unites with the Baptists. This simple act, without any change of sentiment, qualifies him for communion at the Lord's table; and because he will not unite with the very church that excluded him, in the observance of this ordinance, he is accused of being a bigoted close communionist—of "breaking the church in pieces, by contending for rites and forms," and non-essentials, etc.

Again, suppose that this excluded minister, instead of uniting with the regular Baptists, should unite with the 'Freewill [mixed communion] Baptists,' he could then take his seat at the communion table with the very church that excluded him. In this case, your church would commune with their excluded members. Can they do this with any propriety?

Now, my friend, it is evident, from what has already been said, that if a minister or other member be expelled from any division of the Protestant Pedobaptist church, for holding and promulgating doctrines or sentiments which the church deem erroneous, yet, by connecting himself with a church that is systematically organized, and actively engaged in disseminating the very same doctrines and sentiments for which he was excluded, (be that church Episcopalian, Methodist, Presbyterian, Freewill Baptist, etc.) he immediately becomes qualified, by this act, to return and unite in a joint-participation of the Lord's Supper, with the very church that excluded him. Hence, it is obvious, that the terms of communion adopted by Pedobaptists may oblige them to commune to-day with those whom they excluded yesterday. What, I would ask, can be more palpably absurd, or grossly inconsistent than this? How can your denomination unite in the church ordinance of the Lord's Supper, with those of other denominations whom you would exclude, if they were members of your denomination? Or, in other words, how can you fellowship that conduct in the members of other denominations, which you cannot fellowship in your own? Is error in other denominations less sinful or offensive than in your own? Or is its turpitude removed by systematic organization carried into effective operation, for its universal promulgation?

Presbyterian.—Having never taken this view of the subject before, I am really surprised to find that our principles of communion, when carried out in practice, are apparently marked with such gross inconsistency. Indeed, my brother, your illustrations have so shaken my confidence in the belief, that the terms of our communion are scriptural, that I feel myself really unprepared to give an answer to your inquiries: and besides, my business is so urgent, that I am under the necessity of leaving.

[*Brother T. enters just as Brother P. is departing.*]

Why, really, here comes our good Methodist brother Thomas, who by the way has been immersed, and is also a strenuous advocate for open communion; he I presume will take my place.

Baptist.—Be seated, my brother. My friend P, and I have been conversing on the subject of open and restricted church communion.

Methodist.—My brother, I have often desired to converse with you on this same subject, but thought it would appear rather impertinent in me to introduce it. But as this seems to be a favorable opportunity, I will proceed, by inquiring: Why do you refuse us, whom you deem baptized, admission to the communion table?

Baptist.—One reason is, because we consider you *disorderly walkers*, in that you commune with those whom we deem unbaptized; i. e. those who have only been sprinkled in their infancy. Now, were we to commune with you, we should virtually sanction your conduct, and thus “express our fellowship for infant sprinkling second-handed.” And we might as well express our fellowship for it, to the Pedobaptists themselves. But why, let me ask, do you not join our church?

Methodist.—For the simple reason, that we cannot fellowship your doctrines and church organization.

Baptist.—For the same reason we refuse to admit you to our communion.* If you cannot fellowship a church in its doctrines and organization, how can you enter that church, and unite with them in a joint-participation of the Lord’s Supper?

Methodist.—Our denomination, I presume you are aware, are in favor of open communion. Therefore we cheerfully invite you notwithstanding our differences.

Baptist.—But, My brother, in doing that, you not only violate the dictates of reason and sound philosophy, but even the rules of your book of Discipline. For, in the 22nd section of that book, you say: “No person shall be admitted to the Lord’s Supper among us, who is guilty of any practice, for which we would exclude a member of our church.” And in the 18th section, you are required to expel “those *ministers or preachers*, who hold and conscientiously disseminate publicly or privately doctrines which are contrary to your articles of religion;” and by the 7th section of the 2nd chapter, to expel private members for “disobedience to the order and discipline of the church,” or for “inveighing against either your doctrine or discipline.”

Methodist.—And is not this as it should be? Can a “house divided against itself stand?” “Can two walk together except they be agreed?” And is not the practice of excluding for heresy justified by apostolic example, and the concurrent practice of almost every Christian sect in the world?

Baptist.—Most certainly! And I believe that every church that is striving to keep the doctrines and ordinances of the church pure, as they were first delivered to the saints, and who value truth and their internal peace more than they do numbers, will reject those persons, whom they deem

* “We doubt whether the Methodist denomination can long retain its present organization. The clergy have the whole ecclesiastical power in their hands. That the laity, in this republican country, have so long submitted to the absolute sway of the clergy, must be attributed, partly to the peculiar character of their members, and partly to the fact, that the power has on the whole, we presume, been wisely and faithfully employed. As knowledge increases among the laity, they will demand a share in the management of their concerns. There has already been a schism. A part of the Methodists seceded in 1830, and formed a constitution and discipline for themselves. They have adopted the name of PROTESTANT METHODISTS, discarding the exclusive sway of the clergy, and admitting the laity to a share in the government, but adhering in most other respects to the usages of the Methodists. They have now about 60,000 members and they will undoubtedly increase, unless the Methodist shall modify their polite.” (Christian Review, vol. 2d, p. 202.)

deficient in the fundamental doctrines and discipline of their church. And this surely is restricted communion. But I am not finding fault with your rules of discipline, for requiring you to restrict your communion to those who coincide with you in the "doctrines, order, and discipline" of your church,* but with your denomination, for violating its plain requirements. Now, my brother, your church invite communicants of other denominations, with their ministers, to unite with you, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper; when, if those very persons were members of your church, you would exclude them from all "privileges of society, or sacraments in your church," because they "hold and disseminate" "doctrines contrary to your articles of religion." Do you not, in this manner, pour contempt upon the requirements of your Book of Discipline? (See the 22d and 18th sections, also the 7th sec. of the 2d chapter.) Now, how can you, with any show of consistency, admit the members of other denominations to the most distinguished privilege in the church, (i. e. the Lord's Supper,) and then debar them from admission to regular membership in the church, merely on account of a difference of opinion, on points confessedly of minor importance? If such persons cannot be admitted to membership in the church, how can they, in consistency, be admitted to the church ordinance of the Lord's Supper? Jehovah saith, (Lev. 24: 22) "Ye shall have one manner of law as well for the stranger as for one of your own country." Hence, if a Christian brother is entitled to admission to the communion table, for the same reason he is entitled to every other privilege pertaining to church membership.

Methodist—Do I understand, then, that it is your opinion, that church communion ought to extend only to those persons who can be admitted to regular membership in the church.

Baptist—These are my sentiments. I believe that this restriction is founded in the very nature of things, and is the only proper, consistent boundary to communion. Then those persons who can be admitted to membership in the churches of any particular denomination, may be admitted to the communion in the churches composing their own denomination, on the same principle that they, as members of one church, remove their standing to a sister church in the same connection.

Methodist.—My friend, to say nothing of your restricted communion, it is deeply to be regretted that there are any obstacles in the way that prevent the cordial communion of all evangelical religious sects, but surely we cannot be culpable for these obstacles, while we cheerfully invite all these sects to our communion.

Baptist.—My brother, we have before shown, but you was not present, that the principal obstacle which prevents a cordial communion at the Lord's table, between the members of the Baptist and Pedobaptist church, is the substituting, by Pedobaptists, *infant and adult baptism for believers' baptism*; and so long as you with others practise this substitute, so long

* The Roman Catholics restrict their communion to those of their own church. The Episcopalians would do the same, if they acted in accordance with their sentiments, for they will not admit that, among all the Protestant churches, themselves excepted, that there is one minister or officer legally ordained, and therefore no ordinances duly administered, and consequently no churches scripturally organized. Hence they do not exchange pulpit labors with the ministers of other sects, nor invite them to take any part in their religious worship, but close their pulpits against them. Now if they refuse to invite these ministers to take any part in their public worship, because they cannot admit the validity of their ordination, how can they invite these same ministers with their members to communicate with them, when, by so doing, they practically admit the validity of their baptism.

you will lend your influence to perpetuate this obstacle; but when your regret shall become so deep as to cause you to return to primitive immersion, then, and not till then, will you remove this obstacle, or cease to be culpable for its existence.

But in inviting the members of all religious sects to the Lord's Supper, you are inconsistent with yourself, i. e. with your rules of discipline. How can you invite us to a joint-participation with you at the Lord's Supper, while you believe we are actually engaged in promulgating doctrines that are not only derogatory to God, but even subversive of all revealed religion? Such you represent our sentiments to be. See your tract No. 35. In that you affirm that the doctrines which we hold have "a direct tendency to overthrow the whole Christian revelation;"—that they "represent our blessed Lord an hypocrite, a deceiver of the people, a man void of common sincerity;" and again, "the most holy God as worse than the devil! as both more *false*, more *cruel*, and more *unjust*."

Methodist.—My friend, as this tract was written by one of the members of our church, the whole denomination ought not to be held responsible for it.

Baptist.—I am very ready to acknowledge they ought not to be, if it was only printed by him, and circulated by his means; but the truth is, this tract was not only written by John Wesley, the founder of your denomination, but it is published under the authority of your church; and circulated throughout this country by their means. Hence your denomination are responsible for the statements it contains. If they are true, and we were members of your church, you would be compelled to exclude us. Hence you cannot, by the rules of your discipline, nor with any show of consistency, admit us to the Lord's Supper. If they are not true, then you are guilty of detraction, and *we* could not, even by your rules of discipline, admit you to the Lord's Supper, until by a proper confession you give evidence of repentance. As we cannot admit that these statements are true, we are compelled to believe that you have slandered us.

Methodist.—Our Pedobaptist brethren welcome us to their communion table, and they hold the same doctrinal sentiments that you do; and ought not you to do the same?

Baptist.—My friend, their practice can never form a rule for our conduct. We are required to follow the apostles example, only so far as they followed Christ. We derive our rule from our Lord's commission, and the apostle's example. By this we feel ourselves bound to regulate our practice: But were we invested with the right to "ordain, change, or abolish rites and ceremonies" in the church, as your 22d article evidently implies, perhaps we could so arrange things as to admit all whom we deem Christians. But we have never been invested with any such authority, and we have no desire to be. Those who claim to possess this legislative power, ought, in order to justify themselves in the exercise of it, to show by incontestible evidence, that they received their credentials from none other than Jesus Christ, the Lawgiver in Zion.

But, my friend, as you are so strenuous for what you term open communion, what happy result, I would ask, has it ever produced, or do you expect will ever be accomplished by it?

Methodist.—We expect it will produce a generous, fervent charity, and a kind, fraternal feeling among all denominations who practise it, and eventually break down the barriers that separate all these various sects.

Baptist.—My friend, if open or mixed communion would only break down the partition walls that now separate the various sects of Pedobap-

tists, and unite them harmoniously into one denomination; or, if it could be shown that it has any such tendency, I should regard it far more favorably than I now do. But judging from the experience of the past, I anticipate no such results. Where has the practice of it abated the acrimony of party feelings, or calmed down the waves of conflicting sentiments, among the various sects that sometimes, though seldom, practise it? Where has it ever united two of these sects into one, or even prevented divisions from arising in each individual sect,* or so strengthened the bands of Christian affection and social intercourse, as to lead its ministers to a more liberal exchange of pulpit labors. Methodists remain Methodists still, for all that open or mixed communion has done, and they preach as much against the doctrines embraced by Congregationalists and Presbyterians, as ever, and so *vice versa*. Indeed I do not see as there is any more union of feeling existing, between Episcopalians, Presbyterians and Methodists, or even between the Presbyterians of the Old and New School, or between the Episcopal and other Methodists, than there is between either of these sects and the Baptists. Now, until it can be shown, that free or mixed communion has a tendency, to break down the denominational barriers that separate its professed friends, or to produce some of the desirable results alluded to, I trust we shall not be condemned for not adopting it, or for not being able to perceive its utility; especially as we can find nothing in the New Testament to sanction it.

Again, this mixed, or intercommunion with sects so diverse in sentiment, instead of promoting union, is the very thing that will prevent it. This is rendered clear from the following considerations. No individual Christian, that is governed by moral sense, will ever change his sentiments or practice, unless he feels himself obligated to do it. Hence the various sects in Christendom can never become united in faith and practice, until they feel themselves under moral obligation to become so.

Now this free or mixed communion virtually declares, and is admirably adapted to make every denomination which practice it, feel that each has an equal right to his own chosen way, however diverse it may be from every other, in those doctrinal sentiments and duties, which are so explicitly revealed, and so plainly enjoined in the scriptures, that *no man need err therein*. Now if every sect has a right to its own way or belief, then every command addressed to Christians, to be of one mind, is rendered nugatory, and consequently no obligation rests on them to become one in sentiment and practice. Hence, too, it is obvious, that they will never become one while this feeling prevails. And as this feeling is the natural product of mixed communion, it is evident, that so long as it is practised, so long these divisions will continue; hence, we conceive that it is the very thing adapted to perpetuate these divisions.

*The Presbyterian church, after much severe contention, for several years, has at length burst the bands that held her together, and is now very equally divided into two sects:—the one denominated "Old School," and the other "New School" Presbyterians. Recent movements at the South indicate that another division will occur among the New School, on the subject of slavery.—It is worthy of note here, that the Presbyterians of the Old School have declared non-fellowship with those of the New.

Several years since, a very respectable division, in Boston and other parts of Massachusetts, styling themselves Unitarians, came off from the Congregationalists.

The Methodist denomination, as we have before remarked, has already had a schism. A large body of communicants filed off from them, styling themselves Protestant Methodists.

As far as my experience goes, the ministers of any one of these various Pedobaptist sects do not exchange with any other Pedobaptist sect, oftener than with the Baptist. The Methodist Episcopal minister of this place would not exchange with the ministers of the other Methodist societies, even if he would commune with them.

Again, the very origin of free or mixed communion shows that it is wrong. In apostolic times, there was but one denomination; and had all Christians followed Christ's directions, and the apostles' example, there never would have been but one. They were all required to do this. Had they obeyed this requirement, there would have been no denominational divisions, and consequently no mixed communion. From this, we perceive that mixed communion is an invention of man—that it had no existence in apostolic times, but originated in the denominational divisions caused by Christians disobedience; consequently when these divisions cease, mixed communion will cease. Hence it follows, that mixed communion is wrong, as it is the very offspring of disobedience, and ought not therefore to be practised.

I would remark here, my brother, that there is neither precept or example in all the scriptures, to authorize the true church, or those who "keep the ordinances as they were delivered," to receive to the communion, those Christians who have departed from the prescribed order of Christ's commission, and from apostolic example.

Finally, there is a manifest inconsistency, in Pedobaptists or Baptists inviting different denominations to the church ordinance of communion, and then refusing to unite with them in one denomination. This requiring certain qualifications for admission to the church ordinance of communion, and very different ones for admission to church membership, had no existence in apostolic times, and consequently has no scriptural authority to sustain it. But if there be any scriptural authority for mixed communion, is there not the same scriptural authority for mixed membership? Where is there any distinction to be found in scripture? If apostolic precept "enjoins mixed communion, it also enjoins mixed membership with all its train of evils;" but "if it does not enjoin such a union with Pedobaptists in church membership, neither does it authorize their reception to communion in a church ordinance."

Methodist.—My friend, I have never looked at this subject in this light before. By showing the origin of our principles of communion, and their effects when carried out in practice, you have certainly made them appear not only unreasonable, but even very inconsistent with scripture; so much so, that I am resolved to re-examine the subject, before I again attempt to defend it. You will therefore excuse me. [*Exeunt*]

Pedobaptist.—Well, my friend, as our Presbyterian and Methodist brethren have left, I would just state that during the progress of your conversation, in which I felt a deep interest, several of the objections that rested with some weight on my mind, you very satisfactorily answered. Still, as a whole, I am dissatisfied with my brethren's defence of the Pedobaptist views of communion, and with your consent I should like to resume the conversation.

Baptist.—Please to proceed.

Pedobaptist.—Your denomination, my friend, regard baptism as a prerequisite to the Lord's supper, and yet your practice is so inconsistent with your principles, that you will not even commune with those persons, belonging to Pedobaptist churches, who, in your judgment, have been baptized. How do you reconcile your practice with your principles?

Baptist.—My dear brother it is true, we regard baptism as an essential prerequisite to church communion, but not the only one; for even this, in the absence of faith and a manifest Christian walk and character, can never in our view qualify a man for church-membership, or for a participation with us at the Lord's Supper. The reason why we do not as-

sociate with this class of persons in the celebration of this ordinance because they endorse and sanction that conduct in others which we believe is heresy and which they could not approve themselves in doing.* "It is an acknowledged principle, that voluntary association with offenders, implies a sanction of their faults." It is on this principle that all church discipline proceeds. Hence the apostle exhorts us not to sanction the disorderly walk of our brethren by a continuous fellowship with them. "Now," says Paul, "we command you brethren in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that ye *withdraw yourselves* from every brother that walketh *disorderly*." And the Baptists I believe are not alone in requiring that those should maintain an orderly Christian walk to whom they extend church communion. Now these persons who have truly been baptized, not only endorse and sanction what we deem erroneous in others, but they practically deny the sentiment that baptism is a prerequisite to communion and church membership, (a sentiment held by their own and almost every other denomination,) by communing with those whom they deem unbaptized. Hence the reason is obvious why we do not commune with these persons. But were we to commune with them we should fellowship them in the practice of communing with unbaptized churches. For the same reason we could fellowship ourselves in practising intercommunion with unbaptized churches.

Pedobaptist.—My brother, suppose you were to unite with them in church communion what consequences would follow? Would you not thereby exhibit more of the Christian Spirit and affection than you now do?

Baptist.—Suppose we were to commune with them we must virtually acknowledge that the commission of Christ and the practice of the apostles are not sufficient evidence to prove that baptism is a prerequisite to communion, and if they are not sufficient evidence to prove that position, then they are not sufficient to prove that faith is a prerequisite to baptism.†

On this supposition let us see what consequences would legitimately follow. Now it is evident if we give up the sentiment that baptism is an essential preliminary to church communion, for the same reason we should give up the sentiment that faith is an indispensable qualification for baptism. And when these principles are surrendered we have not

* Several years since a man resided in one of the towns of Connecticut, by the name J. Grant, who had been sprinkled in his infancy, and was then a member of the Congregational church. By studying his Bible he became convinced that BELIEVERS are the only scriptural subjects, and immersion the only gospel baptism; and regarding baptism as a prerequisite to communion, and himself as unbaptized, he could not consistently come to the communion table. In the meantime he informed his minister of his change of views. After some conversation, the minister, finding that nothing else would satisfy his mind, told him that he would immerse him. "So they both went down into the water," and he immersed him, "and when they came up out of the water, he went on his way rejoicing." As he was on his way to meeting, at the next communion season, he said to himself, "J. Grant could not commune with J. Grant, [i. e. with himself,] before J. Grant was baptized; therefore he staid away from the communion! Now, if J. Grant could not commune with J. Grant before J. Grant was baptized, how can he commune with all the other members of this church, who are in the same condition that J. Grant was before his baptism, or in other words, how can J. Grant fellowship others in doing that which he could not fellowship himself in doing." The result was, he withdrew and united with a Baptist church. Now there are multitudes like J. Grant, who are in sentiment Baptists, and yet they are so inconsistent as to unite with a Pedobaptist church by immersion; and in this manner throw the whole of their influence in favor of what they deem error, and against their own peculiar sentiments.

† We have shown, in the former part of this "Conversation," that the Commission of Christ, and the uniform practice of the apostles, are the main evidences that support both of these positions.

only completely abandoned that beautiful, primitive, apostolical mode of church-building but we have demolished the foundation and superstructure of our own denomination, that noble edifice which alone is modeled after the apostolic church. Hence it is perfectly obvious why Pedobaptists are generally so lavish in their praises of open communion. The more intelligent part of them know very well that in this manner they are contending most effectually, though indirectly for their own views of baptism. And should we unite with them, we should adopt the most effectual measures to extinguish our denominational principles; and consequently "*to annihilate, as such, all the Baptist churches in Christendom!—to dissolve the only community of Christians which* (in the opinion of Sir Isaac Newton,) *never symbolized with the church of Rome!—to unchurch the only churches in the world, in which* (our opponents themselves being judges) *the ordinances of Jesus Christ are kept as they were delivered.*" Nor is this the only result, for if apostolical precedent is not deemed sufficient evidence to prove that baptism is a prerequisite to church communion, then it is not sufficient to prove that baptism is a prerequisite to church-membership. Therefore should any church contend that unbaptized persons should be admitted to the communion table, for the same reason that church should admit such persons as regular members of the church. And should any be granted admission into the church, without the observance of the rite of baptism, for the same reason, permission should be granted those persons to remain in the church without the observance of the rite of communion. In this manner the standing ordinances of the gospel dispensation commanded to be kept as they were delivered may be abolished by our denomination. And if the Baptist denomination give up these ordinances because apostolic example is not deemed evidence sufficient for their observance; for the same reason all Pedobaptist denominations might give them up and we must then go over to Quakerism. These consequences must unavoidably follow, upon the hypothesis, that apostolic example is not conclusive evidence, that baptism is an indispensable qualification for church communion. Hence we conclude that a principle that involves consequences so preposterous, cannot have its foundation in truth and ought not to be admitted. Therefore we are compelled to admit, as the only alternative, that apostolic example does prove that baptism is an indispensable prerequisite to church communion. Upon this admission, it follows, that if we would act in conformity to apostolic example, and follow them as they followed Christ, and keep the ordinances as they were delivered, 1 Cor. 11: 1, 2, 23, we have no scriptural authority to commune at the Lord's table, with those whom we deem *unbaptized*; nor with those, who, though baptized, are nevertheless in other things not conformed to "the apostles' doctrine and fellowship." Let those who desire to commune with us at the Lord's table, prove to us that they have been baptized, and that they are walking in the order and faith of the gospel, and we will most cheerfully unite with them in the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

Pedobaptist.—My friend, the disastrous consequences which you have shown, would inevitably follow, by giving up the principle that baptism is a prerequisite to communion, which you must do, in order to commune with us, proves conclusively that you have adopted the only reasonable course. I perceive, also, that in censuring you, we condemn ourselves; for we, as a denomination, commune with only those whom we deem baptized, and you do the same. Now, I am thoroughly convinced, that your general principles of communion are correct, but then there are several objections which I have frequently heard urged against restricted com-

munion, which I have never heard satisfactorily answered. "How can you fellowship Christians and Christian ministers, in prayer, praise, and preaching, and yet not admit them to communion?"

Baptist.—"For this, my friend, we have scriptural authority, in the exhortation of Paul: 'Whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing.' We have attained to an agreement in praying to the same God and Father of all; and also in preaching the gospel of his Son Jesus Christ; but we have not attained to an agreement respecting the subjects and mode of baptism, nor in the visible qualifications of communicants at the Lord's table."

Pedobaptist.—"My friend, your answer appears very satisfactory, "but do you not, by your course, *unchurch* other denominations, and say, they are not churches of Christ?"

Baptist.—"We do not say they are not churches of Christ. True, distinguished Pedobaptists have said, '*where there is no baptism, there are no visible churches;*'* but we regard it as sufficient for us, to say of those brethren who do not administer the ordinance according to the law of Christ's kingdom, that *those churches are not regularly constituted.*"

Pedobaptist.—"My brother, whether our churches are regularly constituted or not, one thing is certain, we are commanded to be followers or imitators of God, Eph. 5: 1, and he you know communes with all Christians.

Baptist.—"My friend, I am very willing to admit, that we are commanded to be followers (imitators) of God; but it does not follow, from this fact, that he communes with or fellowships all Christians, whether obedient or disobedient; for if he does this, then it plainly follows that he fellowships us in observing believer's immersion exclusively, and in rejecting all Pedobaptists from the communion table, and also that you are bound to do the same; so that the very objection you urge against our peculiar sentiments and practice, proves that you are bound to fellowship us, in those sentiments and practice.

Pedobaptist.—"I perceive that my objection is wrong, for it is based upon the assumption, that God communes with all Christians, whether right or wrong, and if he were to do this, he would appropriate the *wrong* as well as the *right*, which would plainly contradict his revealed will. But I presume that you will grant that we are obligated to follow God in fellowshiping all Christians, in those acts in which he fellowships them. Now, my brother, have you any evidence, that the Baptists, in the observance of their peculiar sentiments, are imitators or followers of Christ, and that the Pedobaptists are not; or that Christ fellowships the Baptists as Baptists, and that he does not fellowship the Pedobaptists as Pedobaptists?"

Baptist.—"As we are commanded to follow Christ, it is plain that, as he, and the apostles who followed his example, went down into the water, and were baptized (immersed) before they celebrated the Supper, we are obligated by the command to follow their example; and if any Christian (though a Pedobaptist) is unwilling to do this, God cannot fellowship him, in this act of disobedience; and hence it follows, that *we* have no right to do it. Now, it is a fact that God places the broad seal of his approbation upon the delightful primitive ordinance of believer's immersion, by blessing it not only to the conviction and conversion of many souls, but to the unspeakable joy and peace of mind of multitudes who literally observe it. This we deem strong corroborative evidence, that he fellowships those who observe it. (See Ps. 51: 12, 13.) At the same time, he withholds the

* Dr. Griffin.

Spirit's convicting influence, in the observance of (Calvin's substitute) infant and adult sprinkling, which we think is strong collateral evidence, that he does not fellowship it; and if HE does not fellowship it, we have no right to do it. Now, my brother, if you and all other Pedobaptists were to imitate Christ's example in this respect, we should all commune together, not only in the ordinance of baptism, but in the Lord's Supper, and the *close communion* about which you complain, would forever cease to exist.

Pedobaptist — But, my brother, you know, on a certain occasion, Christ ordered his disciples not to forbid one casting out devils who followed not after them.

Baptist. — My friend, it is evident that the apostles had received no authority, for prohibiting the man's casting out devils, or for ordering him to follow them; but Christ has authorized his churches and ministers, "to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," and to teach Christians "to observe all things whatsoever he has commanded." Finally, my brother, refusing Pedobaptists admission to the communion table, is not forbidding them to preach, and pray, and do all the good they can.

Pedobaptist — But, my brother, you know it is said: "The communion is the Lord's table, and therefore you have no right to forbid or hinder any of his children from coming to it."

Baptist — That it is the Lord's table, we are very willing to grant; there are we are bound to observe the rules he has given us, touching the requisite qualifications for admission to this feast. Were the table ours, we could invite whom we please, without any regard to baptism. And we do now most cheerfully invite all real Christians to the Lord's table, but we invite them first to baptism, agreeably to the commission of Christ and apostolic example. And unless it can be shown from the scriptures, that unbaptized persons were admitted to the communion, in the primitive apostolic churches, we must still believe, that we have no scriptural warrant for inviting such. We have shown that there is no more impropriety in admitting unbaptized persons, to regular membership in the church, than there is in admitting them to the communion.

2. If the "communion is the Lord's table," the church is the Lord's house. Now almost all denominations are agreed that baptism is the door or passage appointed by Christ, for entering this spiritual building; and no denomination admits any one as completely a member of this household of faith, who has not, in their view, passed through this door. Hence, we cheerfully invite all believers, who desire to participate with us in the provisions of his table, to come in through this door of the Lord—the Grecian, apostolic porch—this highway, cast up for the ransomed to walk in. Now, my brother, if any believers still refuse to accept of this free, full, and scriptural invitation, to come in through this apostolic passage, because it is not modeled to suit their fancy or convenience, who is to blame if they continue without, and do not partake of the provisions of his table? Certainly we are not; for we had nothing to do with modeling this building: that was done by Him who "is too wise to err;" even our Master Jesus Christ; and he has given us no authority to construct a side entrance, in the Roman style, in deference to the mere fancy, and for the accommodation of Christian strangers;—thus granting them a privilege, which we deny all who wish to become members of our household.

Finally, my brother, if it follows that because the communion is the Lord's table, and the church the Lord's house, therefore every believing child of his, has a right to enter this house, in deviation from his prescribed requirements, and partake of the provisions of his table, then with equal

propriety it will follow, that because the "earth and the fulness thereof is the Lord's," therefore every one of his children has a right to enter any enclosure, and partake of the fruits of the earth, and appropriate the cattle to his own use, in deviation from his requirements.

Pedobaptist.—"We shall all commune together in Heaven, and ought therefore to commune together on earth."

Baptist.—My brother, we shall all join one denomination in Heaven, and ought therefore to do it on earth. All Christians in Heaven obey the commands of God, and if they would do it here, the Baptist denomination would gladly receive them to the Lord's table. Again, "the inhabitants of Heaven have no kind of communion with any who are not admitted into the heavenly church. Hence, we act contrary to the spirit of heaven, whenever we commune with any whom we will not admit into the gospel church. Therefore, the example of the saints in heaven, does not teach us to violate the prescribed order of Christ's institutions, by inviting unbaptized persons to the communion." Hence, it is obvious, that the blame rests on those who depart from the gospel order, and forsake "the apostles' doctrine and fellowship."

2. My brother, as the church on earth is differently organized from the church in heaven, it must be evident to any one, that there is a manifest incongruity in arguing from heaven to earth. "In the admission of members to the celestial church, Christ acts as a Sovereign; in the admission of members to Christian churches on earth, we must act as servants—yielding implicit, undeviating obedience to the directions of our sovereign Lord. The communion of 'the just made perfect,' in the heavenly church, will not consist in partaking of the symbols of Christ's death; but in high and spiritual intercourse; in mutual expressions of adoration and gratitude while reviewing the dispensations of providence and grace towards them in this world; in mingled songs of praise to Him who hath washed them from their sins in his own blood; and in exalted converse concerning the glorious scenes, which the revolutions of eternity will be continually unfolding to their delighted gaze. We rejoice in the blissful anticipation of this communion. But we are not willing to wait until that period. We would enjoy here an earnest of that sublime and celestial intercourse. We plead for a communion on earth, with Christians of every sect, which shall bear a resemblance to that of heaven. In such communion as this all good men may partake, without ever sitting at the table of our Lord.

Pedobaptist.—My friend, a sense of duty constrains me to acknowledge that you have not only conclusively and satisfactorily answered my objections, but fully convinced me, that your practice of restricted communion, is in exact harmony with the great law of the commission, and with the practice of the apostles and primitive churches.

But, my brother, I find nothing in the precepts and example of Christ and the apostles, to authorize or sanction those denominational divisions which now exist among the Redeemed; but, on the contrary, they require all Christians to believe the same truths, Rom. 1: 16; to follow the same example, Eph. 5: 1; to perform the same duties, Matt. 7: 12; to contend for the same faith, Jude 3; to keep the same ordinances, and that too as they were delivered, 1 Cor. 11: 2; to speak the same thing; to be perfectly joined together in the same mind and same judgment, 1 Cor. 1: 10; and in fine to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded, Matt. 28: 20. Indeed, the whole tenor of the New Testament evidently goes to show, that all Christians are required to be *one* in sentiment and practice, and consequently one denomination. (See Matt. 5: 29; 15: 9; Rom. 6: 17; Eph. 4: 3—6, 13; Phil. 1: 27; 2: 2; Thes. 3: 6; Titus 1: 13; Peter 4: 11.)—When, my brother, shall these partition walls be demolished? Must they always stand? Is not the time coming, when these "divisions shall cease,—when we shall see eye to eye, and lift up the voice together, and speak the same thing, in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the gospel?" Is not this happy state of things

held forth in prophecy? Has it not been guaranteed by promise? Did not our Saviour pray for it? Have we indeed any reason to doubt that it will be accomplished? What Christian object should the church more devoutly labor and pray for, than this? What one is more desirable? What would more impressively convince the world of the truth of Christianity, than to see all evangelical denominations uniting on the principles of the gospel? Is there no ground, my brother, on which this union may now be consummated without any sacrifice of principle or truth?

Baptist.—My brother, your queries, the precepts of the New Testament, and the waste places of Zion, show the importance of a visible union among the evangelical friends of Christ. You inquire if these partition walls shall always stand. My desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they may not; and I believe there *is* ground, even now, on which we can all meet, without any compromises of truth or duty. As far as my knowledge extends, the Baptist denomination are ready and willing to make every sacrifice they can, except conscientious principle, for the sake of promoting the general union and communion of the godly. This they cannot sacrifice; nor can any one reasonably ask them to do it. Now if the Pedobaptists were willing to do the same, we might all become one denomination, and we believe they are bound by apostolic example to do it.

Pedobaptist.—How, my brother, do you make this appear?

Baptist.—Paul, you know, on a certain occasion, said, “if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no more meat while the world standeth.” To partake of meat was evidently a gratification to the apostle; but he was willing to forego or sacrifice that gratification, as it was no sacrifice of principle, provided it caused “his weaker brother to offend.” Now, my brother, are we not bound to follow the apostle’s example, and to adopt the same principle that he did, when by thus doing we, not only remove the stumbling blocks of offence from the path of our brethren, but take the most effectual means to produce a visible, cordial union and communion among Christians of all evangelical denominations?

Pedobaptist.—Most certainly, I think we are; and it must be evident, my friend, that every denomination of Christians, that is unwilling to make every sacrifice they can conscientiously, to bring about so desirable a result, do not really deprecate or lament the evils which naturally grow out of the many divisions of the church; but actually prefer *disunion to union*, even when the latter could be purchased without any sacrifice of principle. Can any denomination, that takes such ground as this, duly appreciate the importance of the union and peace of the church? But as you stated that you believed that there is ground, even now, on which we can all unite, without any sacrifice of principle, I should like to have you point it out.

Baptist.—Our denomination and the Pedobaptists are agreed as it respects the terms of communion at the Lord’s table. The only disagreement that exists, is respecting what constitutes Christian baptism. If we were agreed in this, we might become one denomination. The Baptists believe that immersion is the only valid baptism, the Pedobaptists that either immersion, pouring or sprinkling is equally valid, and that baptism is *non-essential*. It is perfectly clear, then, that the Pedobaptists can all submit to immersion, and that too without sacrificing any principle, and then we could all unite in communion at the Lord’s Supper. But, my brother, we have shown, we think, conclusively, that if we were to commune with Pedobaptists, we must either embrace their sentiments, or adopt principles, which, if carried out by all denominations, would annihilate all gospel ordinances, and carry us over unavoidably to Quakerism. They can adopt a

course, as we have shown, which would require no sacrifice of principle, and then we could all commune together, and I believe that the example of Paul obligates them to do this. I am also fully convinced that if all Christians could be brought to love each other with pure hearts fervently, that prejudices would vanish, partition walls would be demolished, and all would not only be willing, but joyfully adopt this one baptism, Eph. 4: 1, that we might "have one body, one spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above us all, and through us all, and in us all." Such a state of things as this "is a consummation devoutly to be wished." Nothing perhaps would go farther to convince the world of the truth of Christianity. This would cause them to exclaim, "behold how these Christians love one another."

Now if your denomination, who regard baptism as nonessential, and feel indifferent whether pouring, sprinkling, or immersion be observed, (regarding all of these modes of applying water as equally valid.) are not willing to adopt that one baptism in which we all can unite, I ask, on whom rests the guilt of "breaking the church in pieces, by contending for rites and forms," or *nonessentials* and costume in religion?" Who are actually responsible for these divisions, and the close or restricted communions, about which there has been so much noise; those, who with the Christian world on their side for thirteen centuries, believe that immersion only is baptism, and consequently cannot practise either pouring or sprinkling; or those, who, while they admit that immersion is baptism, yet nevertheless will not practise it, when they are well aware, that by so doing, they would not only terminate close communion, but break down the principal barrier that separates the Baptist and Pedobaptist denominations.

Pedobaptist.—Your arguments, my friend, have finally convinced me, notwithstanding all that has been said against your denomination's being close communionists, that the sin of close communion lies at the Pedobaptists' door; hence I have resolved, in my own mind, to be baptized the first opportunity that occurs, for I am determined that my example shall go no farther, either to countenance or perpetuate close communion. You have now advanced your most weighty arguments, I suppose, to prove that it is the duty of all *believers* to be immersed.

Baptist.—By no means, my brother; we could pass by every argument that we have adduced, to prove that the immersion of a believer only is scriptural baptism, and even admit (what cannot be proved) that your arguments, advanced to prove infant and adult sprinkling, gospel baptism, are as conclusive and valid as our own urged against it, and then prove incontestibly that every Pedobaptist believer, in health, is bound by reason, philosophy, wisdom, sound logic, and common sense, to be baptized (immersed,) if he has never observed this rite.

Pedobaptist.—Indeed, my friend, I do not see how you can admit that our arguments in favor of sprinkling are as conclusive and valid as yours against it, and then prove incontestibly, that reason, wisdom, prudence, etc. proclaim that it is the duty of every Pedobaptist to be immersed?

Baptist.—My brother, I prove this by analogy. Suppose that a man is very sick, and a council of physicians are called, who, on consultation, come to a perfect agreement as it respects the nature of the man's disease, and the medicine to be administered. The servant is despatched to the apothecary to obtain the medicine; soon he returns with three boxes of pills, purporting to be the same medicine, and says that the apothecary purchased them for the same, (though they differ somewhat in appearance,) and that the Doctors can take their choice of the boxes. The attending

physician opens one of the boxes, and passes it round to each of the physicians, with the individual inquiry, are these the genuine pills, Doctor? Their replies advertise him, that a part of them believe that they are the genuine medicine, and the other part that they are not. He opens the second box, and passes it round, when he finds that they are again divided in opinion precisely as at first. He then opens the third box, and institutes the same individual inquiry as before, when he is apprised by their replies that they are unanimous in the belief, that this box contains the genuine pills. He also gives it as his opinion, that this box only contains the genuine medicine. He now asks the patient which of the boxes of pills he will take, as the servant is to return the other two. The patient, instead of giving a direct reply, addresses him as follows: "Do you, Doctor, sincerely and conscientiously believe that the two first boxes of pills examined, are not genuine? They say that those are more palatable and easier to take. Would you not take them, were you in my condition?" "I would not, I could not take them, were I in your condition," replies the attending physician, "for I do sincerely believe that they are not the right medicine." "Well then, Doctor," says the patient, "as you are all agreed that one of these boxes contains the genuine pills, I will therefore take that, for I am resolved, that I will never take a *questionable, doubtful medicine*, when I can take an *unquestionable medicine*. I will never run the hazard of going wrong, when I may be sure of going right; hence, as I wish to stand on the safe side of the hedge, I will take the medicine which you all agree is genuine." I ask now, if this man has not acted prudently, wisely and conscientiously. Would he, could he have acted thus, had he taken the *questionable, doubtful medicine*? Now, my friend, this is a correct representation of the baptismal controversy. A part of the Christian world believe that pouring or sprinkling is valid baptism—the other part that they are not. But all agree that immersion is valid baptism. Hence it is perfectly obvious, to say the least, that pouring or sprinkling is *questionable, doubtful baptism*, and that immersion is *unquestionable baptism*. Now, will a believer, who sincerely wishes to obey the command of Christ, in the ordinance of baptism, observe the questionable rite of sprinkling or pouring, when he might observe the unquestionable and primitive rite of immersion? Will a man be sure he obeys Christ in this ordinance, or will he run the hazard of disobeying?

Pedobaptist.—My friend, you have proved conclusively, and to my entire satisfaction, that it is the plain duty of every Pedobaptist believer, to observe the unquestionable rite of immersion, which is taking the safe side of the baptismal question, and that every one, who observes the questionable rite of sprinkling or pouring, takes the unsafe side, and, to say the least, runs the hazard of not only violating the command of Christ, but of teaching others, by his example, to do the same. And, in view of your illustrations, I do not see how any candid man, can observe the questionable rite of sprinkling and pouring. But suppose I should reply to your argument in the language of my Pedobaptist friends, when driven to the extreme: "that baptism is nonessential," or at least, "it is not a saving ordinance."

Baptist.—Am I to infer, my brother, that, as baptism is not a saving ordinance, therefore it is of no consequence whether it be rightly observed or not?—that we are under obligation to observe only those precepts, the neglect of which, we are sure would ruin our souls? Are we not bound to yield implicit obedience to every command of Christ?—to keep all his "ordinances as they were delivered?" Did not he who enjoined this ordinance say, "If ye love me, KEEP MY COMMANDMENTS?" and again, "then are ye my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you?" plainly implying, that if we do not his commands, we are not his friends. Now we have shown, we think conclusively, that it is the duty of every believer, to be immersed, who would act as prudently and wisely, in obeying the command to BE BAPTIZED, as he would act, where his temporal interest is concerned. What evidence, then, have those persons who practice sprinkling for baptism, to show that they are actually the friends of Christ. Finally, my brother, if all Christians were assured that they could not be

saved, unless they were actually baptized, how many do you suppose would practise either pouring or sprinkling.

Pedobaptist.—I presume not one, for they would all reason thus. If the application of water in any manner be baptism, then the Baptists are baptized as well as we; but if immersion only is baptism, then those, and those only, who are immersed, are baptized, and consequently they alone can be saved. Hence, those only who practise immersion occupy safe ground.

Baptist.—Now, my brother, if that Christian only, who were assured that his eternal salvation depended upon the validity of his baptism, would take safe ground, who observes the rite of immersion, then it is equally obvious, that those Christians only take safe ground who practise immersion, when obedience with its important results depend upon the validity of their baptism. Now, if all Christians take safe ground only when they practise immersion, then it is equally manifest, that the Church takes safe ground only when she requires immersion. Therefore none should be admitted into the church, nor to the communion table, who have not been immersed. My friend, the general union and communion of the godly is a "consummation devoutly to be wished;" but I am confident that they will never unite only on the safe side of this controverted subject. And as all believe that immersion is baptism, those who prefer union to disunion, will practise that only. Now, from what has been said, I believe that it is evident that immersion is essential to obedience;—essential to settle all doubts in the mind of a Christian, about the validity of his baptism;—essential to the union and communion of all evangelical denominations; and consequently essential to the salvation of sinners, for there are millions of this class who can only be saved, by Christians becoming united in "the apostles' doctrine and fellowship." Finally, my dear brother, in conclusion, I would say, that I am not surprised, that you have changed your views on this interesting subject, when I call to mind, your prayerful determination, at our first interview, to seek for truth, and "to renounce every religious sentiment, not authorized by the word of God." If you are now satisfied what is your Master's will, "happy are you, if you do it." You also have the consolation of knowing, that you are not alone in your change: multitudes who have thoroughly and prayerfully examined this subject, have been conducted to the same result;* multitudes more are still in doubt respecting the validity of their baptism, and probably will thus continue, until they are willing to take the safe side of this question.

Now, my Christian brother, may God grant that his word may prove, as a lamp to our feet, and as a light to our path, and guide us into all truth. And may it be our fervent prayer, that the time may speedily come, when all Christians shall be united in the faith, order, and fellowship of the gospel.

* I have seen notices of the baptism of some eight or ten Pedobaptist ministers, since this year commenced. Prof. Jewett informs us, in his work on Baptism, published in 1839, that "a Baptist minister of Western Virginia, within the last four years, has baptized over two hundred persons, who had already been members of Pedobaptist churches. An aged minister, now residing in Mississippi, has, at various times, buried with Christ in baptism, more than four hundred persons of this class, of whom forty were Pedobaptist ministers!"

CONTENTS.

PREFACE.—INTRODUCTION,.....	3
CONVERSATION.	
PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS—Baptism an indispensable prerequisite to Church Communion, and Faith equally as indispensable a prerequisite to Baptism,....	5
SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.—Infant Baptism not taught in the Commission of Christ;—nor found in the Household Baptisms;—nor in the Abrahamic Covenant;—nor in any part of the Scriptures;—nor in the Church, until the close of the second century;—Objections urged, answered, and explanations of certain passages given,.....	12
MODE* OF BAPTISM.—The signification of BAPTIZO (from which Baptism is derived) is ascertained to be immersion:—First, by Classical and Sacred usage; Second, by the figurative use of the term; Third, by the places selected for the administration of the rite; Fourth, by the practice of the early Christians and the Christian world for 1360 years; and Lastly, by the change of the rite of Immersion for Sprinkling,.....	24
Explanation of passages where the word BAPTIZO is translated to WASH; and others where the ordinance is mentioned;—Objections to exclusive Immersion answered,.....	52
CONVERSATION RESUMED.	
Further objections and questions answered, including among others, "Mode of Baptism," Baptism a Seal, etc.....	69
John's Baptism essentially Christian Baptism;—Christ's Baptism, its design;—The argument that Pouring is Baptism answered;—Baptism ascertained to be Immersion, by substitution;—in Baptism, man is applied to the water, and not the water to the man,.....	79
The literal import of the Greek prepositions EN, EK, EIS, used in connection with BAPTIZO, is in favor of Immersion, and APO does not militate against it;—The resemblance of Immersion to a Burial;—The Baptists not guilty of Bigotry, nor of Sectarianism, nor of dividing the American Bible Society;—Pedobaptists not blessed in the observance of the rite of Sprinkling, as Baptists are in the observance of the rite of Immersion;—The Baptists the first, in modern times, to advance and defend the principles of Christ and Religious Liberty, etc.;—The importance which Baptists and Pedobaptists respectively attach to the rite of Baptism;—The affirmation that the Baptists are of recent origin considered, and abundant historical evidence adduced, to show that persons holding their distinguishing sentiments, have existed in every age of the Church,.....	93
CONVERSATION RESUMED.	
General remarks about Close Communion;—The distinction between Christian and Church Fellowship,.....	114
Restricted Church Communion not peculiar to the Baptists;—Pedobaptists, as well as Baptists, restrict their communion to those whom they deem baptized;—Pedobaptists more restricted in their communion than the Baptists;—Pedobaptism the legitimate cause of what is termed CLOSE COMMUNION;—Sincerity alone does not prove that a man is right;—The practice of the Apostles;—The Lord's Supper a Church ordinance;—The principles of Communion adopted by Pedobaptists sometimes involve them in the most gross inconsistencies,.....	117
The reason Baptists do not commune with all whom they deem baptized;—Methodists violate their Rules of Discipline by practising Free or Mixed Communion;—The proper boundary to external Church Communion;—Tract No. 35;—Baptists could not commune with Methodists, even by their Rules of Discipline;—The practice of Mixed Communion will not promote, but prevent union, and perpetuate disunion;—Its very origin shows that it is the offspring of disobedience,.....	124
Baptism not the only prerequisite to Church Communion;—If Baptists were to commune with Pedobaptists, they must adopt principles that would, if carried out, annihilate all gospel ordinances;—Other objections answered, and explanations given;—The duty of all Christians to become one in sentiment and practice;—Pedobaptists are obligated by Apostolic example, to be Immersed;—Pedobaptists alone are responsible for Close Communion;—The duty of all Pedobaptist Believers to be Immersed,.....	129

* The word *ongis* is sometimes used in this conversation to designate the true import or action of Baptism.



